

The South Atlantic Quarterly

Vol. XXXIX

OCTOBER, 1940

Number 4

THE NAZI THREAT TO THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

HOWELL M. HENRY

IT IS NOW reasonably certain that Nazi Germany has for some time planned the political control of South America and the exploitation of her natural resources. Secretary of the Navy Knox has recently made public a series of articles written by Colonel Wm. J. Donovan, who has been abroad on foreign missions, in collaboration with Mr. Edgar Mowrer which outline the methods of Nazi penetration in foreign countries. In recent months the *New York Times* has dispatched Messrs. Russel B. Porter and John W. White, two competent and experienced reporters, to study and describe German activities in the regions to the south of us. Apparently they, with others of the reportorial staff, have had access to official reports and other reliable sources of information. The public of the United States is indebted to this news agency for much of the information summarized in this paper. Probably the first things to attract the attention of the Germans were the economic resources of the West, the vast storehouse of raw materials, and the possibilities of the ever-developing demands in South America for manufactured goods, for thus was afforded a market for the products of German industry. The acquisition of these benefits by the Nazis would be facilitated by rather weak political organization and feeble military defenses of the twenty republics of the Torrid and South Temperate zones. Too, the geography of distances makes this more feasible when it is observed, as was pointed out by President Roosevelt in a recent fire-side chat, that the distance from the point farthest west of Africa to the eastern hump of Brazil is considerably less than the distance from New York to most of Europe.

AP2

S7

V.39

Their plans include the building up of German communities of interest in each of these Latin-American countries, composed of alien Germans, naturalized German citizens, and persons of German descent. They, in turn, have been organized into strongly centralized Nazi-conscious units, thoroughly imbued with Nazi doctrines. "Heil Hitler" is their password, and the touchstone of their ritual. The swastika is usually as much in evidence at their meetings and headquarters as appears to be prudent. Military drill, sometimes carried on secretly, under the direction of retired German officers or a veteran of the World War, is a distinct feature of their meetings. They do not hesitate to undermine the government in which they happen to live, or to defy it, when such action best serves their purpose. These units apparently regard themselves as potential Fifth Columns to further Nazi interests. They look forward to a *Der Tag* when Nazi domination may overturn the present regimes. In such case, they will become the dominating small inner circle that will govern and determine the economic fortunes as well as the political destinies of these small nations.

Germany holds to the "double nationality" theory of citizenship. Under this policy a German may assume citizenship in any other state, without losing German nationality, or being absolved from obligation to the Fatherland. Again, the descendants of German citizens born on foreign soil are similarly bound to serve the Fatherland as against any other allegiance should occasion arise.

This claim of Nazi Germany on persons of German blood will help to explain the formidable threat they present to American institutions. The number of German immigrants and descendants of German immigrants in the Latin-American nations is considerable. The figures given below for total population of a few of the South American states are official. Those for the German element are estimates believed to be reliable.

<i>State</i>	<i>Total Population</i>	<i>Germans</i>
Argentina	12,762,000	250,000
Bolivia	3,426,396	10,000
Brazil	43,346,931	2,000,000
Chile	6,626,508	16,000
Colombia	8,730,000	4,000

Ecuador	2,756,552	4,000
Uruguay	2,093,331	72,000
Venezuela	3,451,677	3,000

The figures for Argentina and Brazil include descendants of Germans to the third generation. For the rest the numbers represent only native-born Germans emigrating from their homes in Europe to the countries named.

Nazi organizations have as their object the building up of centers or nuclei for political influence, which may act as Fifth Columns or sources of revolutionary activity. The German embassy or consulate is the headquarters of the bunds in each country in which the embassy or consulate is located. The minister or consul himself is not infrequently the chief director of propaganda and the adviser of the alien group. Among arrests made in Uruguay of Germans accused of pernicious political activity, one directly implicated was found to enjoy diplomatic immunity since he was an attaché of the German embassy. It is apparent, too, that agents sent out from Berlin act as organizers and instructors in military tactics and *agents provocateurs*.

The plan of action is to bring into a closely knit unit all resident Germans, alien and naturalized, all descendants of Germans, and as many native persons of influence as possible. Pressure is brought to bear in several ways. Germans refusing to co-operate frequently find their business boycotted; if they are men with good jobs they likely find themselves discharged; recalcitrant Germans are told that near-relatives, father, brother, sister or other family connection still resident in the Fatherland, will be made to suffer loss of property or suffer bodily injury, or may find themselves in a concentration camp. From what is known of Nazi ruthlessness, it is easy to believe that this is not an empty threat. On the other hand, there is held out the promise of rich rewards in business advantages and political preferment to the loyal when the day of Nazi dominance arrives. But loss of all business and political standing is threatened to those who fail to go along with the Nazi schemes. The money to finance these plots is usually raised among the bund members themselves. An assessment amounting roughly to 5 per cent of a member's income is laid as dues. In the case of some more prosperous single

men the contribution demanded is as much as 10 per cent. It is generally believed that these devices are sufficient to hold all Germans in line. The amounts spent for propaganda are rather large. The German colony of 10,000 in Bolivia is reported to be spending \$30,000 to \$40,000 a month. In Colombia, with a German colony of 4,000, reports are that propaganda expenditures amount to as much as \$60,000 to \$70,000 monthly. According to estimates, the German embassy in Brazil spends from \$50,000 to \$100,000 monthly.

Their program of activities deals largely with propaganda. Advertising space in influential newspapers is purchased in large quantities. A pro-Nazi newspaper in Bolivia gets \$450 a month for a page of advertising favorable to Germany. Even pro-British papers obtain a large source of their income from this advertising. Journals enjoying the benefit of this advertising are expected to use the Trans-Ocean News Service, which colors the war despatches so as to make the most favorable impression for Germany. The war items leave no doubt as to its final outcome and paint in glowing terms the advantages of the inevitable German victory. These papers using the German news service are frequently furnished free to newsboys for sale. In some cases these newsheets find it convenient to have a German to rewrite and re-edit their news before it goes to press. A few decidedly pro-ally and pro-United States newspapers that refuse to use the Trans-Ocean News Service and who resist Nazi propaganda, find all advertising of German businesses withdrawn. At least one newspaper was forced to suspend publication for this reason.

Much the same methods are used in broadcasting. The bund is responsible for having broadcasts made, not only favorable to Germany, but also full of glowing praise for the Nazi system. News-casts sent by shortwave from Berlin are furnished for rebroadcast. Stations using this material are given all of the radio advertising of German businessmen. A distinct effort is made to see that the radio broadcasts as little as possible favorable to the Allies and the United States. In some cases it has been found that secret broadcasting stations have been established undoubtedly for use in time of revolution or for other questionable propaganda.

The movies, too, have become the vehicle of Nazi propaganda. Newsreels and other materials are frequently furnished to favorably disposed theaters. One of the favorite scenes intended to impress,

and, if necessary, intimidate the populace, was one showing the attack on Poland which displayed the efficiency of the German army. Outdoor free movies with similar pro-Nazi propaganda are maintained. In one theater that refused to use any Nazi propaganda materials, a large number of Germans gathered and when the show began, started a riot by throwing stench bombs. The theater's business for that particular time was ruined.

The activities of these alien groups look also to eventual military opportunities. Pieced together, their plans have in view a day when force can be used by a small, but closely knit, efficient, intelligent and aggressive minority to make itself felt as a deciding factor in case of a revolution. Or, should a victorious Germany find it necessary, this group might assist in setting up puppet governments, in which they would be a powerful influence for dictatorship. Accordingly, they have made military training a part of their program. A ranch owned by a German, somewhat removed from publicity and well guarded by sentries, affords a suitable place for meetings and drills. It is estimated that there are as many as 25,000 trained German soldiers in Brazil held as extralegal storm troops. Colombia, with a German population of 4,000, has 1,000 Germans of military age, many of them in training. In Argentina the government unearthed a secret cache of arms hidden by the bund on the premises of a German. This collection contained 50 machine guns, 3,500 rifles, and several hundred thousand rounds of ammunition. Panzer-division tanks have been imported into Colombia disguised as commercial trucks. Arms bought in the United States have been similarly smuggled into Colombia.

Allied with these military activities are others of a spying nature. An interned officer of the *Graf Spee* was discovered making photographs of the Parana River. Other interned sailors took advantage of liberties allowed them to spread propaganda. It is believed that every point of possible military importance in Brazil has been photographed by Nazis, who in this case have been supplied with funds amounting to one or two million dollars. The followers of a deported Gestapo agent were arrested in Argentina for making attacks on Jews, synagogues, theaters, and business houses belonging to Hebrews. Germans have frequently secured positions as servants in homes of important people with a view to obtaining information.

Pilots operating airplanes of German companies have been rotated from country to country, apparently with a view to acquainting them with the terrain of the whole continent. This is at variance with the usage of most commercial airways, where accident to pilots and planes is reduced to a minimum by pilots flying continuously the same routes. An American miniature of the Gestapo in Ecuador checks on the incomes of several thousand Jews, and maintains a list of the more influential persons with a view to ascertaining whether each is pro-Nazi, pro-English, or pro-United States. Ecuador with a population of less than 3,000,000, and with an inefficient government, is more exposed to these activities than the other South American states. In other cases these undercover activities have included efforts to educate the people to the dictatorship form of government. To this end they have attempted to place teachers with totalitarian ideas in the public schools. The armies are frequently pro-Nazi in their sympathies, since they have been trained in many cases by German army officers. Despite all these efforts, it appears that the people of South America have a strong friendship for the United States. Mr. John R. Mott, whose long lifetime of travel qualifies him to speak, thinks that 90 per cent of the people of South America are more friendly to the United States than to any European power. In some cases, aliens of known subversive activities have been deported, and native or naturalized Germans have been placed under arrest.

In May, Uruguay with an area of 72,000 square miles and a population of 2,000,000 people presented the clearest case of Nazi penetration by the German bund, which was sufficiently important to arouse the interest of the United States Government to the extent that the cruiser *Quincy* was sent on a "friendly call" to the port of Montevideo, followed by the *Wichita*, another unit of the United States Navy. Argentina, despite its large German population, also, was led to offer assistance should it be needed. Wedged in as it is between Argentina and Brazil, the latter, too, has keen interest in Uruguay's welfare. About the middle of May, Brazil suggested to Uruguay that inquiry into subversive activities of Germans within her borders should be made. Investigation showed that a plan had been drawn up by which a rebellion was to be precipitated and the government overthrown; disaffection was to be brought about in the

Uruguayan army; German veterans in Uruguay and in Argentina were to join the malcontents; a temporary government was to be set up, followed by a dictatorship; there was then to be a wholesale massacre of Jews, former government officials, and Masons; finally, the country was to be turned over to Germany as a colony. All of these plans were in writing, and the paper was seized by officers of the Uruguayan government. Hans Fuhrmann, the leader in the plot and the one who wrote the letter, was known to have been in communication with Rudolph Hess, the next in line in the German government to Goering. Associated with him was an attaché of the German embassy in Montevideo. But diplomatic pressure by Germany was immediately exerted, with the threat that unless the Germans arrested were released the German minister would be recalled. German firms brought business pressure to bear by offering better business credits than had before been allowed. The public feared the loss of markets. Consequently, about ten days later all persons arrested in connection with the affair were released. It was rumored that one of the South American nations (probably Argentina or Brazil) had advised through diplomatic channels that the matter be dropped. It was also current talk that Uruguay had approached the United States Government on the subject of a \$7,000,000 loan to make possible suitable arming to enforce the government's authority, but that the loan had been refused. Illustrative of the arrogance of the Nazis was the return of one of the arrested men after release to upbraid the chief of police who made the arrests, and to tell him that he would later have to answer for this affair.

Next to Uruguay, Chile offers the best example of the pernicious activity of the Nazis. In Chile there are two parties, a Popular Front and a Rightist party. Hence the Germans appeared as a balance of power. Accordingly, they control affairs very largely in southern Chile, where their numbers are greatest. There the schools are patterned after the German schools, and German ideas generally prevail. Documents seized by Chilean officers leading to the arrest of thirty-nine Nazis for distributing literature critical of the President showed that the Nazis, in case of victory in Europe, were to aid the Rightist party in bringing about a revolution to overthrow the Popular Front government. The revolutionists were to have the assistance of the Nacionalistas, an extralegal militia trained and commanded

by a retired German officer. The southern part of Chile was then to be taken over by Germany as a colony. There was a rather formidable organization set up and operating in every part of Chile. A newspaper financed by a pro-German bureau had been making bitter anti-Jewish attacks. The German bund here had been bold enough to try to force non-German elements to contribute to their treasury. This group had been unusually active in its anti-United States activities, urging the merchants to delay orders until September when the war in Europe according to their forecast would be won by a victorious Germany. Then Germany would be in position to give better business terms than the United States. Should war occur between Germany and the United States, these incendiary Germans were to sabotage Chile's copper and nitrate mines and refining plants. However, Chile's business ties with the United States are considerable. United States-built airplanes are preferred over German, and Chile is glad to have trainers of pilots come over from her great northern neighbor. Too, the United States Export-Import Bank has lent \$12,000,000 and United States private banks and businessmen have lent an additional \$5,000,000 to Chilean enterprises. Accordingly, there was organized an unofficial Sixth Column with agents to recruit adherents in all parts of Chile. These are undertaking to guard roads, docks, mines, and public buildings in order to prevent sabotage. They will also keep an eye on more than 50,000 Germans in southern Chile, check radio signals from Berlin, and watch for any unusual activity of the Condor air lines across the Andes. It is reasonable, therefore, to suppose that they are alert and not likely to fall an easy prey to the Nazis, unless these subversive elements are reinforced from the outside and the United States is caught off guard.

Because of the proximity of Mexico to the United States, Nazi schemes in that country have special significance. The Nazi agents have been very active in this nation. Recently a national election was held in which a president was chosen. The Nazis furnished funds to both candidates and tried to dominate the policies of each campaign. It has been their policy to attempt to participate in the activities of any party or organization that has any worth-while following or influence. They have formed a secret organization of which the old Falangista Española is a part. The Falangists are the

old conservatives who were inconvenienced by the social policies of recent administrative reforms. This party, dominated by the Nazis, claims a membership of 150,000. Too, the Communist party has adopted Nazi policies and has been dominated completely by totalitarian ideas. It will be recalled that a few years ago the Mexican government seized privately owned land and oil properties, a good part of which belonged to citizens of the United States. There have been diplomatic exchanges between the United States and Mexico in an effort to reach a settlement. These alien groups in keeping with their general policy have spread a great deal of propaganda to prevent the two nations from reaching an understanding. They have referred to "Yankee imperialism" and have tried to impugn the motives of the Good Neighbor policy. Notwithstanding all this widespread propaganda the Mexican people remain friendly to the United States. Apparently the bund has overplayed its hand in Mexico, and resentment has been stirred up among the people at large. Indeed, Almazan made friendship for the United States the main political policy of his campaign for the presidency.

Soon after the World War, Germany began to develop commercial flying. The way in which this experience has been turned to account for military purposes in Europe is familiar to everyone. Germany's interest in developing air routes in South America began early. With the expansion of Germany's military power at home, and her propaganda measures in the Western Hemisphere, it soon became evident that her air connections would be of great importance should she adopt an aggressive policy in the Americas. The Brazil Condor German-controlled lines have been subsidized by the government as far back as 1927. These lines connect Brazil with all her South American neighbors. The German corporations in Brazil control fifty planes with seventy-five pilots and a ground force of one thousand men. The German air lines in Ecuador have not been well developed, partly because of the rather sparsely settled country. These lines, however, connect Quito, the capital, 9,000 feet above sea level, with Guayaquil and Esmeralda. Air routes lead over the Andes and connect in Peru with other air lines from Brazil to Lima. This concern has two Junkers planes and twenty pilots. Early in the summer, investigation was made by United States officials along the coast. They were convinced that there was a plot to overthrow the

governmental regime in Ecuador and to establish a revolutionary authority amenable to Nazi ideals. Accordingly, the cruiser *Erie* and a destroyer were sent on a "friendly visit" to the chief port of Ecuador. The proximity of Ecuador to the Panama Canal, which is well within flying distance, makes everything in the field of aeronautics in that region of vital importance to the people and government of the United States. The present equipment would not make possible a bombing and return trip from the canal. A "suicide flight," without return, would be practicable. Furthermore, these planes might transmit signals to and from hostile vessels at sea. A company with financial backing in the United States is willing to take over the German lines, but apparently is not willing to do so without a government subsidy. The government of Ecuador, on the other hand, does not wish to cancel the contracts now existing unless it can be sure of service from another source. Of more importance is the situation in Colombia, which lies adjacent to the Panama Canal. Here the Germans began their flying efforts as far back as 1919. Their lines include a route over the Panama Canal. The danger to the canal in case of a hostile Germany is of acute interest to the United States and Colombia. However, recently an American-Colombian line has taken over the German lines. Meantime the Congress of Colombia passed a law permitting the control of air lines to be exercised only by native-born Colombians.

Why is Germany so much interested in Latin America? The answer is to be found in economic advantages to be had. To the German mind, unlike the English, economic advantages necessarily imply political control and imperial organization. This desire for concurrent political domination accounts for their endless scheming and questionable international conduct. But their main objects are to gain access to raw materials and to secure markets for their manufactured products. The competition has been keen among England, Germany, and the United States. The most simple illustration is coffee. Coffee is in universal demand over the whole world. Most of the South American countries produce the coffee berry, but with Brazil it is the main staple. Brazil, then, must sell this coffee in order to be able to buy of her customers. Cotton is another illustration. Cotton is grown in increasing quantities in Brazil and some of the other Latin-American countries. None of this cotton can be sold in

the United States since the United States is an exporter of cotton. The same is true of wheat, meats, and hides from Argentina. These cases are sufficient to show that although the United States is apparently the logical customer of the South American republics, at least some of the trade advantages are with Europe, since European countries can easily absorb these articles for which the United States has no market. On account of the unstable character of the currencies of Europe, a barter system has been introduced which tends to limit the purchases made by Germany to the amount of German goods which Latin America will buy from Germany. Certain indispensable articles, such as tin, rubber, and manganese, come from widely separated points in the world. It is thought by a commission of experts appointed by President Roosevelt that some of these articles now imported from places in the East which may fall under the control of the totalitarian powers, can by developmental effort be secured in South America. Tin ore is available in large quantities in Bolivia. The United States has been negotiating with Bolivia in an effort to have the tin ore smelted in the United States, but stiff opposition from Germany has been encountered. Lead, zinc, and copper in South America can render the Western Hemisphere independent of the East. The growing of rubber in countries to the south of us is still in the experimental stage with good prospects of success.

Surpluses and overproduction have plagued the United States as well as other nations of the world. But, with all trade handled by a government monopoly in Germany the opportunities for buying and holding are facilitated. Brazil has frequently harvested more coffee than the world market can absorb. A nation that can take up this surplus at a fair price is in a position to demand political concessions if there is a disposition to take such advantage. It has been said that to Latin-Americans "good neighbor" is synonymous with "good customer." The war in Europe has contributed to the accumulation of these surpluses. Chile's exports to England dropped during the first seven months of the war from \$7,000,000 to \$1,000,000, and her exports to Germany from \$7,000,000 to \$310,000; Argentina is considering the advisability of burning six million tons of corn; Uruguay is left with one half of her wool clip on hand; Brazil is piling up surpluses of coffee, cotton, and lumber; Cuba's sugar prices are lower

than at any time during the height of the depression, and there are few purchasers.

All this upset to normal business brought about by the blockade and shifting of consumption has given these countries anxiety regarding the future. German agents are telling South American merchants that the war in Europe will close with a real early "all-out" victory. Buyers are urged to delay their orders until mid-autumn with guarantee of prompt delivery by German exporters. It is generally believed that Germany is buying in the United States to fill these orders in case the blockade is not lifted by October. Where intimidation may prove effective these countries are left with the idea that friendly agreement will prevent trouble from Germany later. A victorious Germany will dictate trading terms, and any country that has not maintained a friendly attitude in this period of stress will find itself discriminated against, should Germany dominate the situation economically and politically. Furthermore, the United States, whose political interests are affected most, finds that her merchants demand 40 per cent cash on orders in New York, while Germany sells on longer time and smaller down payments. The danger of all this to the United States is that trade agreements made by Germany after a possible successful war may include clauses with political concessions. It might be demanded by Germany of the Latin-American countries that they be given naval bases, flying fields, or the placing of German officers in their armies. These demands might be made for real or fancied concessions in trade. At varied intervals the United States has restricted the sale of arms to Latin America in order to minimize revolutionary activity. In many of these cases the Germans have furnished the desired arms and, in addition, supplied the officers necessary to the training of the soldiers in their use.

It was with a view to meeting this menace that President Roosevelt proposed a gigantic trading cartel. This would be a \$2,000,000,000 trading corporation with capital furnished by the government. This concern would purchase all exportable surpluses estimated at about \$1,200,000,000 annually, of the Latin-American countries, and would then sell them at such times and on such terms as would be most favorable to the producers. One criticism was evident from the first, that it would tend to increase surpluses. A

writer in the *United States News* summed up the practical results as follows: "If the plan now proposed had operated in 1938, the United States would have had to buy—in addition to the goods that it did buy—65,000,000 bushels of wheat, 10,000,000 bags of coffee, 725,000 tons of wheat, 1,500,000 bales of cotton, 214,000 tons of wool, 300,000 tons of copper, and about 20,000,000 tons of oil, to mention only a part of Latin America's major exports. The cartel, of course, could be expected to sell substantial quantities of these products, but it would be certain that they would add to our surplus." The idea was not received by the business element of our people as a good economic venture, and it appeared that probably the United States would lose in the long run. Its chief justification, it was felt, seemed to be that it would be a cheaper way to thwart political exploitation than to prevent it by the use of our army and navy. The same misgivings characterized opinion in South America. The businessmen of Brazil were decidedly opposed to it, preferring to take their chances individually in the foreign markets. If the matter was received with indifference in America, it was not so received in Germany. Goering's newspaper, the *Essener National Zeitung*, "warns" South America against participation in any such plan as proposed by President Roosevelt. Otto von Rheinbeck, the German minister to Costa Rica, was very much exercised over the whole matter and "warned" Honduras not to sign any agreement at Havana that would in any way hamper Germany's interests in Latin America. He had in mind particularly the cartel. No less a person than Walter Funk, the economics minister of Germany, made reference to the trade proposal and said that when the war was over, Germany would trade only with individual countries and not with a trade combination. The cartel was not seriously considered at the Havana Conference, though economic co-operation was on the agenda. The blunt statement of Funk appears to have whetted the appetites of the Latin Americans and to have made the idea popular in quarters where it had not before been favorably received. After the discussion had died down without tangible results a United Press despatch reported that they had heard from reliable sources that the administration had abandoned the scheme. Instead, the proposed Export-Import Bank with a capital of \$500,000,000 will extend liberal credits to South American business to facilitate orderly marketing and to promote

greater industrialization of the countries which have large natural resources to develop. In this way it is hoped that Latin America can be made independent of German political pressure exerted through economic channels.

Co-operation of the free nations of the Western Hemisphere has been the watchword of American security for more than a century. Whenever danger to any of the states of the Western World has threatened we have fallen back on the Monroe Doctrine as the main principle of our foreign policy. That idea was originally, and still is, that the United States will undertake to prevent the acquisition of territory in the New World or the establishment of undemocratic institutions in any part of it. The South American people, however, have never felt any very great enthusiasm for its implied paternalism. Incidents like the Mexican War, the Panama revolution, and the intervention in San Domingo and Nicaragua have led the peoples of South America to doubt our sincerity, and to wonder if there should not yet be a corollary to the Monroe Doctrine to the effect that the United States should be under restraint as to interference in the affairs of her sister states. The "Good Neighbor" policy of the present administration has supplied just that self-imposed restraint. Nonintervention in the affairs of other states is at the basis of the Good Neighbor policy. Our relations with our sister republics have improved remarkably within the last seven years. They feel that now all the Western nations meet on common ground and with full political equality.

With this approach it can be more easily understood how we have come to have Pan-American conferences. The first of these was called in 1826 by Simon Bolivar, the George Washington of South America, but there were no practical results. After sixty-three years another met in Washington. In 1910 representatives of the American nations gathered at Buenos Aires and founded the Pan-American Union. After a lapse of thirteen years another took place at Santiago, the capital of Chile. The meetings then became more frequent with a conference at Havana in 1928 attended by President Coolidge. And another conference in 1936 again at Buenos Aires, this latter meeting being opened by President Roosevelt. Two years later representatives met at Lima, Peru. Two followed in rapid succession. One convened at Panama, famous for its declaration for a three-

hundred-mile coastal boundary in time of war. But probably the most notable recently met at Havana, Cuba.

The conference called by the President of the United States to meet at Havana was motivated by the purpose of getting together and devising means of defense against a potential danger from Germany. Germany has conquered Denmark, Holland, and France, and there is the possibility of the collapse of Great Britain. It would be a very real danger to the Western Hemisphere should Germany undertake to seize and hold the colonial possessions of one or more of these conquered nations of Europe. Early in May the United States Senate passed unanimously a resolution, concurred in by the House of Representatives by a vote of 383 to 8, declaring that any transfer of territory held by a non-American nation or attempt to transfer such territory to a non-American nation would not be acquiesced in by the United States. Furthermore, should such a transfer appear likely, it provides that the United States should immediately consult with other American nations as to suitable means for the prevention of such transfer. President Roosevelt, speaking for the United States on May 18, notified Hitler and Mussolini that there must be no attempt at such transfer of sovereignty in the Western World. With these concrete facts superimposed on the background of Nazi propaganda in South America described above, the need for a conference appeared urgent.

The Havana Conference opened on July 22, 1940. Eleven of the nations sent their foreign ministers, while the other ten had official diplomatic representatives. The Germans resident in Latin America were very much perturbed. Mention has already been made of the anxiety felt by these Germans that some joint agreement might be made which would interfere with their trade interests. Otto Rheinbeck, their spokesman, sent notes, apparently on his own authority, to three of the smaller Central American Powers "warning" them against participation in this conference. It was even rumored that Rheinbeck would present a memorandum to the conference itself. It is probable that he was advised by his home government to withdraw his statements. At any rate, he made full apologies. All of these things led to a declaration by Secretary Cordell Hull in a press interview that Germany should keep her

hands off the conference, since this was an American affair to be dealt with by Americans in an American way.

Secretary Hull, the most prominent figure at the conference, made the opening address, now an important state paper. It was largely through the patience and skill of Secretary Hull that some measure of success was achieved. At first Argentina held back, her representative, Dr. Leopoldo Melo, referring to "premature experiments with remedies for problems that may never arise, and whose nature is unpredictable." It may be recalled that Argentina in the past has failed to ratify most of the Pan-American agreements. This conservative attitude in the conference was shared in part by Brazil, Chile, and Uruguay, all of which have large German minorities in their populations. A spirit of compromise, however, prevailed, and, taken all in all, the Act of Havana is a rather remarkable piece of international co-operation. Dr. Leopoldo Melo presented the final report and resolutions of the conference.

The concrete results of the conference have to do chiefly with the sovereignty of the possessions of the conquered European nations. The Act reads: "That the American republics would consider any transfer or attempt to transfer sovereignty, jurisdiction, possession, interest or control in any of these regions to another non-American State as contrary to American sentiments, principles and rights of American States to maintain their security and political independence." There is set up a committee composed of one representative from each nation to take steps to prevent the transfer of the sovereignty of any dependency in the American area. When fourteen members (two thirds) of the committee agree they shall be authorized to meet and consult and take such joint action as may be deemed best. If an emergency should arise when it might not be deemed wise to delay action, any member state of the conference may individually, or jointly with others, take suitable action to prevent a transfer of sovereignty if such transfer is considered to be detrimental to the joint interests of the American states. It is then mandatory that nations acting in this manner and in this emergency shall report their action and the reasons therefor to the full committee. In case of "acephalism" (a loss of identity of the parent nation) this committee has the right to assist the dependency to determine its status, self-determination apparently being contemplated. Any expense in-

curred is to be a charge against the dependency involved. If it cannot be collected, it then becomes a charge against the state or states taking the original step. It is clearly stated that such action taken to prevent transfer of sovereignty is not to be regarded as "intervention," which was outlawed by the Rio de Janeiro Conference. Furthermore, it is clearly stipulated that such management of a dependency's affairs is not to confer any rights or advantages in such dependency to the state or states participating, not enjoyed by all other Powers. A bill of rights is embodied: All steps taken in regard to a dependency shall be in the furtherance of American security; freedom of religion and conscience shall be observed; all nations shall have equal rights of trade in the dependency; all natives shall have the right to participate in the government and its administration; forced labor is banned; a provisional government may be set up in a dependency, to terminate in three years, but may be renewed if a permanent form has meantime not been established.

Canada, since it is technically a part of the British crown, has never been a member of the Pan-American Union. With its virtual independence since the World War, it has naturally been drawn within the scope of the Monroe Doctrine. The tacit protection of Canada by the British Navy as well as the other British possessions in the Western Hemisphere has somewhat obscured this relationship. The menace of a rearmed Germany with the growing threat to the peace of Europe has brought this fact keenly to the attention of the United States. With a view to leaving no misunderstanding President Roosevelt on August 18, 1938, on a visit to Canada, made a speech at Kingston, Ontario, pledging the United States to defend Canada in case of any outside attack. Like the original Monroe Doctrine, itself merely an expression of opinion by the Chief Executive, this inclusion of Canada within the ample pronouncements of our foreign policy met with ready acceptance. Within recent weeks President Roosevelt on behalf of the United States and Prime Minister McKenzie King of Canada met near the border of the two countries and discussed plans for the mutual defense of the two nations. A Joint Defense Commission has been provided for, but the details of the plan have not been made public. Newspapers have reported that probably Canada will be allowed to train air pilots in

the United States during the winter, since the climate of Canada is not suitable for such training at that season.

A Hearst newspaper correspondent secured an interview with Hitler, and he is quoted as saying that any idea of German invasion of America is "grotesque." When this report was brought to President Roosevelt's attention in a press conference he replied that this "brings up recollections." There is a pretty well-defined opinion in this country that we may have to face Nazi Germany eventually, particularly if England collapses under the attack of Germany. England is anxious to place at the disposal of the United States every advantage possible to meet such an attack. Accordingly, about the middle of August, Prime Minister Churchill offered to this country naval bases, with no strings attached, at any strategic points in her Western possessions on a ninety-nine year lease. The offer has been graciously received, and steps have already been taken to avail ourselves of the advantages of these new bastions of defense.

There is evident a determined effort on the part of Germany to secure economic and political control in the Western Hemisphere. The Nazis have already organized bunds composed of persons of German descent in most of the states of South America. These groups are engaged in spreading propaganda, stirring up revolution, and acting as potential Fifth Columns to facilitate future intervention. These bunds are self-supporting but are directed and controlled from Berlin. To carry out their incendiary designs, they have sought to control newspapers, the movies, radio broadcasting, and aeronautics. There can be little doubt that Nazi plans include dominance of Latin America in defiance of the Monroe Doctrine. Another fear is that Germany may seek to assume authority in the American colonial possessions of German-conquered nations in Europe. To forestall this, the American nations met in conference at Havana and took steps to prevent such a realization, resulting in the Act of Havana. Underlying all this political activity are economic conditions including surpluses of production and the failure to adjust foreign markets to national needs.

IMPROVEMENT IN RACE RELATIONS IN SOUTH CAROLINA: THE CAUSE

W. W. BALL

THE ANNOUNCEMENT that for the year ending May 3, 1940, there had been no lynching in the United States was hailed everywhere with satisfaction; and as a cause of the happy improvement, the exertions of a society or commission on "interracial relations" in the South were praised with emphasis and, I say, with ignorant exaggeration. With no intent to belittle the worthy efforts of the men and women of the society, I say that among the factors causing the decrease in lynching in the South has been the very great decline of "interracial relations."

Steadily and, of late years, rapidly, the relations between the white and black races in the South have diminished; the separation in living, in the industries, therefore in association or contacts, has widened and hardened. Other factors, of which I shall speak, have been important in reducing interracial crimes, but the separation, the movement of the two races away from each other, has been the chief among them. Before proceeding I shall explain that I am writing from memory and observation covering a period of at least sixty years, from the time I was ten or eleven years old, or earlier, and that I write of my South Carolina as representative of the Southern States. What I shall say is subject to discount according to the reader's pleasure or judgment.

The twelve years following Appomattox were a time of disorder and turbulence, of semiwarfare in the South, and it did not end suddenly with the return of white man's rule in this state. "Reconstruction," the rights and wrongs of which need not be here discussed, inflamed the two races, the one against the other. Murders, lynchings, riots, arson, and other crimes of violence were common in South Carolina in that time, and the crimes were not the monopoly of whites or blacks. Once, as many as eight or nine Negroes who had murdered a one-armed Confederate soldier were taken from a jail and lynched by the old Ku-Klux Klan; and once, in the village where I was then a baby, in 1870, a riot started and nine or ten

Negroes and a white carpetbagger were killed in a day and night in an area of seven hundred square miles—this was six years before Reconstruction ended. In two riots, in Charleston County, in 1876, white men were victims.

Brutal murders were committed by white men, and by Negroes too. The waylaying and shooting in the dark of a white man by Negroes was sometimes followed by secret murders by white men in revenge. All that is an old story, and historians have carefully collected and recorded its facts.

When the white men came into power in South Carolina, in April, 1877, the resentments kindled in Reconstruction did not die in a year or wholly vanish in three or four decades. Among the whites were a few selfish, gross, and cruel persons—and the white race was dominant again. Lynching and murders of Negroes increased greatly for a time. The crime of rape infuriated the whites, and sometimes, not often, on flimsy evidence, a Negro was hanged. In some cases white men of standing, in rural districts, approved lynchings and participated in them. Still, the first lynching that I, a nine-year-old, heard of was of a white man, the owner of a farm, who had cruelly murdered a white girl of the mountains after assaulting her. This was in a county of preponderantly white population, and within four years of that lynching two white men in that county were tried, convicted, and hanged for the murder of Negroes, after their convictions had been affirmed by the highest court. The county was Spartanburg, and one concedes that those executions were exceptional.

A few weeks ago a writer of fiction, a Southerner, published a short story in a magazine, the gist of which was that a good Negro was murdered by a planter for no other reason than that the Negro desired to improve his condition, to become a property owner. That could have happened in South Carolina fifty years ago. It might happen in Georgia or in any other Southern state now, I do not know, but not in South Carolina. In the days that such infamous crimes were occasional in this state, not less cruel murders of white men by Negroes were sometimes done, and I note an habitual, if not studied, effort of writers for a press that champions Negro causes to forget that there have been Negro slayers of white persons. I

think they were at least as numerous as the white slayers of Negroes half a century ago and afterward.

In the eighties and nineties, when the resentment lingered from Reconstruction, there was also fear among the whites. In 1880 the Negroes in South Carolina were 604,332, the whites 391,105, and ten years thereafter the Negroes were 688,934 to 462,008 whites. There was many a neighborhood in the "deep country" where the Negroes were ten or twenty to one white person. It was an unsettled and violent period that hung over from Reconstruction, and it was not rare that white men of prominence, lawyers some of them, "toted" pistols and shot one another in the street or in the courthouse of the village. Meantime, in those bloody years, the kindly relations between tens of thousands of decent Negroes and their white folks (they were not destroyed altogether even in Reconstruction) survived.

Now for the changes. Slowly they came to be noticeable after 1900. The decade preceding had been full of violence, of lynchings and homicides. Many of the slayings were political, to which Negroes were not party. It was the decade of the angry division of the white Democrats, the followers of Ben Tillman and his opponents. The state liquor-selling system ("dispensary") was set up, and liquor constables and bootleggers sometimes "shot it out."

In the last forty years the homicide rate has continued high; but with steadily declining frequency white men have killed Negroes and Negroes have seldom killed whites. "Shooting scrapes" between white men of social or professional standing have not been half a dozen in the period. The slaying of Narcisso Gener Gonzales, editor of *The State*, Columbia, a brave gentleman, who, by the way, exposed his life more than once in warfare against lynchings and lynchers, by the then lieutenant-governor, in 1903, was one of the last tragedies in which the parties were prominent. The pistol carrying by men calling themselves gentlemen came to an end.

Homicides to which only Negroes are party are numerous every year, and the reformers of distant states profoundly concerned for Negro welfare do not discover that intra-Negro slaughter takes twenty or fifty times as many Negro lives as ever lynchings took. There is far too much homicide among whites, but it is virtually confined to persons that one does not "meet at the club."

Fifty years ago white tenant farmers in South Carolina numbered 12,918, and the white farm owners 38,353. The coming of industry depleted the numbers of landless tillers of the soil. The great expansion of the textile industry took place between 1895 and 1905. In 1890 the male adults in cotton mills were about 2,500. In fifteen years they were about 20,000, and they are now about 40,000. The landless farmers took refuge from labor competition with the Negroes on farms and plantations. They now live in villages, owned by the textile companies, from which Negroes are excluded. The Negroes do not work within the cotton mills. The associations of white and Negro laborers in the cotton, corn, and tobacco fields have been greatly reduced. White women no longer prepare noonday meals for cotton pickers, white and black, and whites and Negroes, men and women, have nearly ceased to plow and "chop" cotton in the fields together.

In towns and cities of South Carolina no "segregation" ordinances have been passed, but long ago the Negroes, of their own will, began to flock together. In Columbia they owned as late as 1910 a church on the corner where the post office now stands, across a street from the State House Yard, and they sold it, as they did a few residences in the heart of the white district which had been acquired during Reconstruction. I helped a colored servant who was and is my friend to buy a house in Columbia, in a colored quarter of course, and later when I offered to help the same man to buy a house in Charleston in a block inhabited by whites and blacks he would not hear of it; he wanted to be with his own people. After the Civil War, Negroes gained possession of many houses of impoverished white families in "downtown" Charleston, a fashionable district. In the last thirty years nearly all of them have moved to Negro districts, the downtown houses have been reconditioned, and white people inhabit them.

In his annual report to the diocesan convention of South Carolina last April, Bishop Albert Thomas of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of South Carolina said that a reclamation, or slum clearance, project for whites, of the federal government, was scattering the Negro population of a Charleston city district and that half the congregation of one of the oldest churches for Negroes in South Carolina, built nearly a century ago by white slaveowners, was being compelled now to find homes elsewhere and was leaving the church

without a sufficient congregation to support it. This brick church was not necessary to the housing project, but unless the government would pay a price for it that would erect a building elsewhere, the Bishop said, the outlook was that the church would not survive. I have later been informed that the government will pay such a price for it. That will be fair and generous, but taxpayers will take a loss. The federal government in its housing projects in South Carolina is rigidly segregating the races, whatever the Supreme Court may have said about the ordinances of St. Louis and other cities some years ago, and to this I am certainly not objecting.

I was twenty-six years old (1895) before I saw a white barber in South Carolina, and not until after the first World War did I see white waitresses in South Carolina hotels and restaurants. One sees them now. As boy and young man in my village I not often saw a white carpenter, cabinetmaker, bricklayer, or blacksmith. The Negro artisans are now relatively few. The garage mechanic has taken the place of the blacksmith and is a white man. This taking over of skilled trades by whites is one explanation of Negro migration to Northern cities.

Negroes are not barred by rule from industries. One finds them in the sawmills. In one city of South Carolina are furniture factories, and in one of them that I lately visited 30 per cent of the 835 workers were Negroes—but, mark, this was a mill in which only men worked. White women work in textile mills. In these furniture factories there has been no race friction.

The gradual and seemingly hard exclusion of Negroes from the skilled trades is not caused by prejudice in the South more than in the North. Employers prefer whites to Negroes when they are to be had at the same wages. I am not discussing the right and wrong of it: I state the fact.

Negro migration on a large scale began in this state in the decade 1910-1920. In 1910 the Negro majority was 156,682 in a population of 1,515,400, and in ten years it dropped to 46,181. In 1930 the white majority was 150,359, in a population of 1,738,765, the whites having made the astonishing gain of 307,041 in twenty years. In the 1920-1930 decade infestation of cotton fields by bollworms drove Negroes from the lands, and demand for labor in the North at wages better than they had dreamed of lured them. Those causes, no

longer operative, do not sufficiently account for the migration. It goes on. The present census will reveal it, unless signs and prognostications are misleading. South Carolina is now a white state by 200,000, possibly 250,000, and federal policies that restrict agricultural acreage are accelerating it. I like those policies in so far as they tend to relieve the South of excessive Negro population. To me, an elderly citizen, living without Negroes would be a hardship, but I am not protesting against the division of the Negro problem or its transfer to Northern cities. It may be axiomatic to say that, other things equal, the reduction of numbers of Negroes to whites tends to reduce "interracial" relations.

In those bad days when lynching was common there was also a kinder understanding between some of the whites and blacks than now exists. A respectable white man usually had Negroes who were his friends, or dependents, who came to him when in trouble. Often the Negroes had been family slaves or were the sons of former slaves, and I could name lawyers of the nineties who never failed to defend "their Negroes" if they were indicted in criminal courts. That relationship has almost disappeared. Between men under fifty and their Negro employees the dealings now are "strictly business." The dealings are fair, but there is no longer sentiment in them. If a white man gives to Negroes, unless to a blind street beggar, it is likely through the Associated Charities or the Red Cross. The generation of whites that has succeeded to the Confederate veterans and their wives has not the understanding of Negroes that its parents had, and it is probably not desired by either race.

So, I repeat, that well meant and praiseworthy as are the works of interracial committees, admirable as is their denunciation of lynching and effort to prevent it, the steady decline of interracial relations has done what they could never have done. Their accomplished results have been in inverse ratio to their good intentions, and it detracts nothing from the good thereof.

Other factors in reducing lynching to a minimum (I am not saying that there will never be another of these savage, cowardly crimes in South Carolina) have been better policing of rural districts, to which paved roads, automobiles, telephones, and radio have immensely contributed. In the spring of this year, a Negro armed

with a gun and "behaving strangely," was arrested in Saluda, the courthouse village of Saluda County. An hour or two later news of the finding of the dead bodies of two women, one Negro and the other white, reached the village, and suspicion instantly pointed to the Negro in jail. No demonstration followed; there was no talk of hanging him. The officers of the law took no chances; in an hour and a half the man was safe in the penitentiary, in Columbia, forty-five miles distant over a cement road. He confessed that he had killed his wife and his landlord's wife, was legally tried, and a month ago was executed. Twenty years ago those murders would have been swiftly and unlawfully avenged. South Carolina now has a small force of rural policemen and also highway, or traffic, officers. There has been no lynching in a town of 10,000 or more inhabitants in South Carolina in a century, if ever, and the last "race riot" in the state occurred forty-two years ago.

The white man lynched in 1878 or 1879, mentioned earlier in this article, was taken from the jail in Spartanburg, then a village of 2,500 persons. About forty-five years later Spartanburg had become a city of 12,000 or 15,000 and had, besides a new and strong county jail, a gallant sheriff named Vernon White. A white woman of a textile community accused a Negro of the "usual crime," and he was promptly arrested. That night a mob of 1,500 demanded the prisoner. He was not surrendered. The mob dynamited the jail's outer gate. The sheriff stepped forward, his rifle in hand, and warned the mob that they might overpower him and get the man but that he and his deputies would kill the first twenty men that stepped across a line in front of the jail's door. The mob milled. No man crossed the line, and the mob dispersed. A few weeks later influential white men got an inkling that the accuser of the man was not a normal person. They investigated, and the prosecuting officer, the late Albert Hill, who told me the story, was convinced of his innocence. The man was tried and acquitted, principally on the testimony of the prosecuting witness, the court as well as the jury approving.

About 1914 a Negro was accused of the "crime against woman" in Fairfield County, was arrested, and was carried to the penitentiary for safekeeping. The sheriff and a deputy brought him back to Winnsboro, the county village, for trial, and as they were entering the courthouse the husband of the accuser shot the sheriff dead.

Within the courtroom of that courthouse is a mural monument to "Ed" Hood, the martyred sheriff.

Generally, not always, a prisoner has been safe from lynching once he was in jail. The weak or cowardly sheriffs and jailers have been the exceptions. Detection and arrest of lynchers have been difficult, next to impossible. The crime was never prevented by punishment of the criminals, the lynchers; but prevention, which is policing, is effective. If in a large city race friction occurs, a truck-load of policemen armed with tear bombs, perhaps machine guns, arrives in three minutes, a crowd of 5,000 is cowed and "moves on." I hazard the opinion that were the policing in New York not infinitely better than it was outside of a city in South Carolina until recent years, there would be race riots and lynchings in Harlem once a week until one or the other race were run out of that mixed community.

To omit saying that the Southern Negroes have notably improved in habits since they were set free would be less than fair. In the decade after 1865 when everybody was poor, stealing by former slaves, which Reconstruction surely did not discourage, was common. Pilfering by servants was expected, and perhaps many cooks saw nothing wrong in it. So Negro men robbed hen roosts and melon patches. I have had, in three or four Southern towns, twenty-five or thirty Negro domestics and I remember but two who would steal. Other servants warned against one of them, to protect themselves from suspicion, and she was dismissed. As for the drivers of my automobile, my family has been as safe with them as my mother and her sisters were with "Big George," the carriage driver, seventy-five years ago.

Most of the Negroes can read and write, in a manner, but I am not sure that immense improvement has followed the acquisition of that facility. Indeed, the spread of literacy among the whites (white illiteracy was common in South Carolina thirty years ago) has not yet ennobled that race. The Negroes are cleaner than they used to be, they dress better, they are more self-respecting, but they are not acquiring homes as fast as they acquire cars. (Nor are the white people.)

Incomparably more serious than lynching, let me stress, is Negro homicide. In the rougher Negro districts of cities it is far too com-

mon and ought to have attention from intraracial committees. Crimes of violence in Do as You Choose Alley (Don't you like the name?), Charleston, South Carolina, deserve the attention of white and colored reformers too much engrossed with contemplation of white men's offenses against "the race."

I would not be interpreted as meaning that there is no assertion of white supremacy in the South. It is more dangerous for a Negro than for a white man to shoot a policeman. (It is not often done.) The commanding fact is that separation of the races grows. White men do not object to Negro progress; they are increasingly willing to give them their share of the public revenues for schools and hospitals, but, unconsciously perhaps, they drew apart from the Negroes and the Negroes draw apart from them. If the races meet on terms approaching equality, it is apt to be a meeting of the baser representatives of both.

As for the courts, the disposition of judges toward the Negroes has always been fair, indeed, generous. The judges have in mind their shortcomings, their lack of advantages. In the majority of cases the white juries are of the same disposition, but there are exceptional cases. The emphasis of the professional writers is on the exceptions, and many of them like to forget that a Negro ever committed a crime against a white man or woman. In South Carolina the interracial crime moves toward the vanishing point because of the decline of interracial relations.

THE SESQUICENTENNIAL OF THE L'ENFANT PLAN

H. PAUL CAEMMERER

THE YEAR 1939 will be remembered in the history of this country as marking the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the inauguration of the Government of the United States of America, the convening of the First Congress, and the inauguration of George Washington as the first President. The Constitution of the United States established the government with its legislative, executive, and judicial co-ordinate branches, and provided for many things needful to the nation, among them a seat of government.

During the past century and a half our national capital, Washington, has grown with the nation, ever since the establishment of a permanent seat of government was considered in 1789. The story of its founding, its growth and transformation into one of the great and beautiful capital cities of the earth, has become more and more interesting in the light of newly discovered information obtained by research into the history of the L'Enfant Plan. This article sets forth these facts, which are based on original source material.

During the War of Independence, and the subsequent period of the Confederation, Congress had met in eight different towns and cities—Philadelphia, Baltimore, Lancaster, York, Princeton, Annapolis, Trenton, and New York City—part of the time pursued by the enemy and after the war by disgruntled soldiers. The Continental Congress was seriously inconvenienced by moving from place to place. To move the records and files was burdensome, and in several of the towns where Congress met the accommodations were inadequate.

Since 1783 sites had been offered by Kingston, Annapolis, and the state of New Jersey. The legislature of Virginia suggested Williamsburg or a site on the banks of the Potomac. These were referred to a committee headed by James Madison, reporting on September 18, 1783. Subsequent proposals came from New York City, Trenton, Reading, Carlisle, Lancaster, Yorktown, and Boston.

The committee raised two questions: first, the extent of the dis-

strict necessary; second, the power to be exercised by Congress in that district. As to the first question, it was reported that the district should not be less than three miles or more than six miles square; and, second, that Congress ought to have exclusive jurisdiction. The report was referred to a committee as a whole, but there is no record that further action was taken.

When the question of a permanent seat of government was again taken up by the Continental Congress, the question of location predominated; the question of exclusive jurisdiction had generally been conceded. The discussion was finally limited to two sites: first, a location on the banks of the Potomac at least as far south as Georgetown, which was favored particularly by the Southern members of Congress as being the geographical center of the United States; second, a site on the Delaware River near the falls above Trenton, which Pennsylvania, Delaware, and the other states nearby favored.

With the convening of the First Congress, two leading factors entered into the question of establishment of a seat of government: jurisdiction and geographical location. It was deemed very important to give the national capital a central location along the Atlantic coast. Debates on this question continued until 1790. Southern members led by Richard Bland Lee and James Madison, of Virginia, argued for consideration of the question by Congress before adjournment, and recommended the Potomac River site near Georgetown. Amidst much discussion, maneuvering, and disappointment the question of location was finally resolved into the consideration of two locations, one at Wright's Ferry, Pennsylvania, near the falls of the Susquehanna, and the other at Georgetown, Maryland, near the lower falls of the Potomac.

By proclamation of January 24, 1791, President Washington directed that a preliminary survey be made. This survey was substantially in accord with the lines subsequently adopted, moving the southern boundary point of the "ten miles square" farther south so as to include a convenient part of the Eastern Branch and also the town of Alexandria, Virginia. Congress amended the Act of July 16, 1790, accordingly, by the Act approved March 3, 1791.

Then arose the question of design for the federal city. For this work President Washington chose Pierre Charles L'Enfant, "the artist of the American Revolution." As early as September 11, 1789,

L'Enfant, who had a few months before completed Federal Hall, in which President Washington was inaugurated, had applied for the position. A letter which he addressed to the President on that date contained the following significant paragraph: "No nation, perhaps, had ever before the opportunity offered them of deliberately deciding on the spot where their capital should be fixed, or of combining every necessary consideration in the choice of situation—and altho' the means now within the power of the country are not such as to pursue the design to any great extent it will be obvious that *the plan should be drawn on such a scale as to leave room for that aggrandisement & embellishment which the increase of the wealth of the Nation will permit it to pursue at any period however remote*—viewing the matter in this light I am fully sensible of the extent of the undertaking and under the hope of the continuation of the indulgence you have hitherto honored me with I now presume to solicit [*sic*] the favor of being employed in this Business. . . ."

Pierre Charles L'Enfant was born in Paris, August 2, 1754, the son of an academician, who was "Painter in ordinary to the King in his Manufacture of the Gobelins," with a turn for landscape and especially for battle scenes. L'Enfant grew up in Paris and Versailles and was trained as a French military engineer. At the age of twenty-three he received a commission as a volunteer lieutenant in the French colonial troops. In 1777 he preceded Lafayette to America by a month among several French officers who cast their lot in the cause of the American Revolution. He was made a captain of engineers in 1778 and was brevetted a major by Congress in 1783.

Major L'Enfant, as a man of position and education and an engineer of ability, was familiar with those great works of the master of landscape architecture, Lenôtre, which are still the admiration of the traveler. Unfortunately he was afflicted with an irascible disposition that led to trouble in his dealings with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and eventually caused him pain and loss. Yet he was a man of ideas and was fond of doing things on a grand scale. Washington had great confidence in the ability of L'Enfant, observing, "Since my first knowledge of the gentleman's abilities in the line of his profession, I have received him not only as a scientific man, but one who has added considerable taste to professional knowledge; and that, for such employment as he is now engaged in, for

prosecuting public works and carrying them into effect, he was better qualified than any one, who had come within my knowledge in this country."

In accordance with directions from President Washington, Major L'Enfant proceeded to Georgetown for the purpose of making a sketch of the area proposed for the Federal City that would enable him to fix locations on the spot for public buildings. He arrived on March 9, 1791. At the time President Washington was making plans for what proved to be his triumphal tour through the South, and it was his desire to meet with L'Enfant and property owners at the end of the month. L'Enfant reported his arrival to Secretary of State Jefferson in a letter dated March 11, 1791, stating that he viewed the ground "in riding over it on horseback . . . through the rain to obtain a knowledge of the whole. . . . I [rode] from the Eastern Branch towards Georgetown up the heights and down along side of the bank of the main river and along side of Goose and Rock creeks as far up as their springs. As far as I was able to judge through a thick fog, I passed on many spots which appeared to me really beautiful. . . ."

President Washington arrived in Georgetown on Monday, March 28. On the following day he inspected the ground, and on Wednesday, the thirtieth, made an agreement with the nineteen original proprietors under which they agreed to convey to the United States Government, in fee simple, such portions of their farms as were needed for streets, without compensation, and to sell such land as was needed for government buildings and public reservations, at £25 per acre (about \$67). The remaining land was to be laid out in building lots and apportioned equally between the federal government and the original owners. In this way, without advancing a dollar and at a total cost of \$36,000 the government acquired a tract of about 540 acres in the heart of the proposed city for public buildings and parks; in laying out the streets 3,606 acres were taken. The 10,136 building lots assigned to it yielded \$850,000.

In the meantime L'Enfant continued the preparation of his plan for the Federal City. From a letter dated April 10, 1791, which Jefferson sent to L'Enfant in reply, we know that Jefferson forwarded, from his personal collection, maps of the following cities: Frankfort on the Maine, Karlsruhe, Amsterdam, Strassburg, Paris,

Orléans, Bordeaux, Lyons, Montpellier, Marseilles, Turin, and Milan, and stated: "I am happy that the President has left the planning of the town in such good hands, and have no doubt it will be done to general satisfaction. . . ."

A comparison of the maps of the cities mentioned, as well as other cities in Europe, proves that they supplied L'Enfant with only isolated suggestions for the treatment which he adopted. Paris, as the city is today, suggests more than other cities some of the marked features of Washington in the streets and avenues which radiate from the Arch of Triumph at the head of the Champs Élysées, but while Napoleon I inaugurated improvements, he was an unknown man when the L'Enfant map was made in 1791. The plan of Versailles by Lenôtre, with its park areas and radiating avenues, doubtless did influence L'Enfant in adopting similar features for the Federal City.

It is also possible the areas occupied by Paris of approximately 800,000 inhabitants, may have influenced L'Enfant in determining the size of the Federal City, for he fixed the area of the new city at about sixteen square miles, which would accommodate about 800,000. President Washington, who, it must be remembered, was also a surveyor, felt that as a city such as Philadelphia, the capital of one state, occupied two or three square miles, the thirteen states of the Union should require a capital city in proportion. We know today that the 100 square miles in the "ten miles square" would not be too large for the national capital of the Union of forty-eight states.

By June 22, 1791, L'Enfant had a more complete sketch ready, and he submitted it to President Washington with a detailed report, calling attention to focal points in the plan, width of streets, locations for executive department buildings, and stating with regard to the location selected for the United States Capitol "for erecting the Federal House . . . Jenkin's Heights stands really as a pedestal waiting for a superstructure."

The locations decided upon were the same as afterward indicated in the completed plan. The Capitol was located, as L'Enfant had wished, on "Jenkin's Heights." The President's House was built at the site indicated in the plan, and one executive department building was erected during the first decade. On August 28, 1791,

L'Enfant presented to President Washington at Philadelphia a sketch and a letter dated August 19, stating, "The high of my ambition is gratified in having met with your approbation in the project of the plan which I now have the honor of presenting to you altered agreeable to your direction." This sketch was discovered by Colonel Lawrence Martin, Chief of the Division of Maps, Library of Congress, among maps relating to Mount Vernon. While in Philadelphia, L'Enfant continued to work on the plan.

The troubles which were going to disappoint him so grievously began when the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, in a letter dated September 9, 1791, requested that "10,000 of the maps to be struck on the best terms, and as soon as possible, leaving what number the President pleases subject to his order, one half the residue to be left in Philadelphia, subject to our order, and the other half transmitted to us. We shall honour your order for the expenses." L'Enfant had arranged with a French engraver, M. Pigalle, to make an engraving of the plan before October, when the District Commissioners wished to use prints of it in connection with a sale of lots. To his great disappointment M. Pigalle failed in the production of the engraving. At the sale of lots there were no copies of the plan to aid the buyers. Washington was satisfied that L'Enfant was not to blame for this deficiency. While the President lauded L'Enfant's ability, it provoked him when he heard that at the sale L'Enfant took care "to prevent the exhibition of the general plan at the spot where the sale was made."

The President was soon to hear of a further unfortunate incident. In November, 1791, L'Enfant, while visiting Aquia Island, in Virginia, to select stone for the Capitol and the President's House—a sandstone of which these buildings were originally constructed—heard of a scheme of Daniel Carroll of Duddington to build his house on the line of New Jersey Avenue at E Street, Southeast, so as to project "about 7 feet" into the avenue (then undeveloped), requiring a narrowing of the avenue from 110 feet to 100 feet. So great was the pride L'Enfant had in the plan that he ordered workmen to destroy the house—much to the chagrin of the Commissioners and the President, for the owner was one of the influential men helping to develop the new city. This rash action on the part of L'Enfant (it cost the government \$4,500 to settle the matter) saved the plan,

but it resulted in a reprimand from the President that thereafter L'Enfant would have to submit to orders from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

The Capital was henceforth to be known as the City of Washington, for on September 8, 1791, it was decided by Thomas Jefferson, Secretary of State, and James Madison, in conference with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, "to name the streets of the Federal City alphabetically one way and numerically the other from the Capitol and that the name of the City and Territory shall be the City of Washington and the Territory of Columbia."

Congress never officially adopted the L'Enfant Plan. What then happened with reference to the plan is perhaps best explained by L'Enfant himself:

At that time too the particular plan and copper plates by me prepared for engraving in the month of August '91 in Phila. had (by reason of the multiplicity of my other avocations at Washington) been unavoidably delayed and lodged in the best place of safety, into the hands of the President as is shown in documents No. 1. But although thus protected a number of my drawing copies had been made therefrom without my knowledge, *such as were seen in both houses of Congress hanging on the Walls in December '91.* Others were sent to Europe, viz., to Portugal and even to Petersburg in Russia. The Commissioners by means of an agent at Phil. in a surreptitious way procured the aforesaid plan prepared for engraving as shown by document No. —, and having effected the engraving prevailed on the President himself to cause the publication whereby having obtained the number of copies they wanted and becoming ultimately possessed of the copper plate they deemed themselves disengaged from the obligation of paying me the value of 10000 copies, which they had before in an affected manner requested of me as the document No. —, which No. proves. . . .

A further grievance that L'Enfant had at the time is set forth in his memorial addressed to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia written from Philadelphia on August 30, 1800, in which he asked redress, ". . . [on] finding my name erased from the title of the Map at the moment of publication and leaving standing on one of my Assistants. . . ."

We are told in the Records of the Columbia Historical Society that the originals of the "Observations explanatory of the plan of the city of Major L'Enfant are in possession of James Dudley Morgan, M. D.," at whose ancestral home L'Enfant lived after 1800 until his death in 1825. This is evidence that the explanatory notes which appear on the plan are actually those of L'Enfant, and that plans or maps made subsequently are based on the L'Enfant Plan. We have further proof that L'Enfant is the author of the plan and of these explanatory notes from the publicity given them by the *Gazette of the United States*, published in Philadelphia on January 4, 1792, of which the following is a copy:

New City of Washington

The following description is annexed to the plan of the City of Washington, in the district of Columbia, as sent to Congress by the President some days ago.

Plan of the City intended for the permanent seat of the Government of the United States, projected agreeable to the direction of the President of the United States, in pursuance of an Act of Congress, passed on the 16th of July, 1790 "establishing the permanent seat on the banks of the Potowmack"—By Peter Charles L'Enfant.

Observations Explanatory of the Plan

I. The positions for the different grand edifices, and for the several grand squares or areas of different shapes as they are laid down, were first determined on the most advantageous ground, commanding the most extensive prospects, and the better susceptible of such improvements as the various interests of the several objects may require.

II. Lines or avenues of direct communication have been devised to connect the separate and most distant objects with the principals, and to preserve through the whole a reciprocity of sight at the same time. Attention has been paid to the passing of those leading avenues over the most favorable ground for prospect and convenience.

III. North and south lines, intersected by others running due east and west, make the distribution of the city into streets, squares, &c. and those lines have been so combined as to meet at certain given points with those divergent avenues, so as to form on the spaces "first determined" the different squares, or areas, which are all proportional in magnitude to the number of avenues leading to them.

Breadth of the Streets

Every grand transverse avenue, and every principal divergent one, such as the communication from the President's House to the Congress House, &c. are 160 feet in breadth, and thus divided:

	Feet
10 feet for pavement on each side is	20
30 of gravel walk, planted with trees on each side	60
80 in the middle for carriage way	80
	<hr/>
	160
The other streets are of the following dimensions, viz.	
Those leading to the public buildings or markets,	130
	110
Others	90

In order to execute the above plan, Mr. Ellicott drew a true meridian line by celestial observation, which passes through the area intended for the Congress House; this line he crossed by another due east and west, and which passes through the same area. These lines were accurately measured, and made the basis on which the whole plan was executed. He ran all the lines by a transit instrument, and determined the acute angles by actual measurement, and left nothing to the uncertainty of the compass.

References

A. The equestrian figure of George Washington, a monument voted in 1783, by the late Continental Congress.

B. An historic column—also intended for a mile or itinerary column, from whose station (at a mile from the Federal House) all distances and places through the continent are to be calculated.

C. A naval itinerary column, proposed to be erected to celebrate the first rise of a navy, and to stand a ready monument to perpetuate its progress and achievements.

D. A church intended for national purposes, such as public prayer, thanksgivings, funeral orations, &c. and assigned to the special use of no particular sect or denomination, but equally open to all. It will likewise be a proper shelter for such monuments as were voted by the late Continental Congress, for those heroes who fell in the cause of liberty, and for such others as may hereafter be decreed by the voice of a grateful nation.

E. E. E. E. E. Five grand fountains, intended with a constant spout of water, N. B. There are within the limits of the city 25 good springs of excellent water, abundantly supplied in the driest season of the year.

F. A grand cascade, formed of the water of the sources of the Tiber.

G. G. Public walk, being a square of 1200 feet, through which carriages may ascend to the upper square of the Federal House.

H. A grand avenue 400 feet in breadth, and about a mile in length, bordered with gardens ending in a slope from the houses on each side: this avenue leads to the monument A. and connects the Congress garden with the

I. President's park and the

K. Well improved field, being a part of the walk from the President's house of about 1800 feet in breadth, and three fourths of a mile in length. Every lot deep coloured red, with green plots, designates some of the situations which command the most agreeable prospects, and which are best calculated for spacious houses and gardens, such as may accommodate foreign ministers, &c.

L. Around this square and along the

M. Avenue from the two bridges to the Federal House the pavements on each side will pass under an arche way, under whose cover shops will be most conveniently and agreeably situated: this street is 160 feet in breadth and a mile long.

The fifteen squares coloured yellow, are proposed to be divided among the several States in the Union, for each of them to improve, or subscribe a sum additional to the value of the land for that purpose, and the improvements round the squares to be completed in a limited time.

The centre of each square will admit of statues, columns, obelisks, or any other ornaments, such as the different states may choose to erect, to perpetuate not only the memory of such individuals whose councils or military achievements were conspicuous in giving liberty and independence to this country; but those whose usefulness hath rendered them worthy of imitation; to invite the youth of succeeding generations to tread in the paths of those sages or heroes whom their country have thought proper to celebrate.

The situation of those squares is such that they are the most advantageously and reciprocally seen from each other, and as equally distributed over the whole city district, and connected by spacious avenues round the grand federal improvements and as contiguous to them, and at the same time as equally distant from each other as circumstances would admit. The settlements round these squares must soon become connected.

The mode of taking possession of, and improving the whole district at first, must leave to posterity a grand idea of the patriotic interest which promoted it.

The small spaces coloured red, are intended for the use of all religious denominations, on which they are to erect places of worship, and are proposed to be allotted to them in the manner as those coloured yellow are to the different States in the Union; but no burying ground will be admitted within the limits of the city, an appropriation being intended for that purpose without.

N. B. There are a number of squares or areas unappropriated, and in situations proper for Colleges and Academies, of which every society, whose object is national, may be accommodated.

Every house within the city will stand square on the streets, and every lot on the divergent avenues will run square with their fronts on the most acute angle, will not measure less than 56 feet, and may well be above 140.

Some of the streets running north and south, and east and west, are about 1200 poles, and the transverse streets about 1300 poles.

Latitude of Congress House, 38. 58. N. long. 0. 0.

X. Tiber creek. The water of this creek is intended to be conveyed on the high ground where the Congress-House stands, and after watering that part of the city, its overplus will fall from under the base of the edifice, and in a cascade of 20 feet in height, and 50 in breadth, into the reservoir below, thence to run in three falls through the gardens into the grand canal.

The perpendicular height of the ground where the Congress house stands, is above the tide of Tiber creek 78 feet.

Perpendicular height of the west branch above the tide of Tiber creeks, 115 feet, 7 inches and two eighths.

This branch and that of the Tiber, is intended to be conveyed to the President's house.

From the entrance of the river Potowmack up to the second, the depth of water is from 5 1-3 to 4 fathoms—the deepest all along the shore where wharves are marked.

The Mr. Ellicott, referred to in these explanatory notes, was Major Andrew Ellicott, who was appointed by President Washington to make a survey of the "ten miles square," or the District of Columbia. This he did and then set boundary or jurisdiction stones a mile apart, some of which are standing in place today. Also, it appears that Major Ellicott was to assist L'Enfant in his work whenever possible.

The controversy that developed concerning the Daniel Carroll of Duddington house became acrimonious. Both Washington and

Jefferson hoped L'Enfant would continue in the work, but he refused to subordinate himself to the orders of the District Commissioners, as Washington had directed. Thus we find that L'Enfant completed his services on the plan in a year's time, for on March 6, 1792, Thomas Jefferson, Secretary of State, wrote to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, from Philadelphia, as follows: "It having been found impracticable to employ Major L'Enfant about the Federal City in that degree of subordination which was lawful and proper, he has been notified that his services are at an end. . . ." Here was the beginning of a strange and stupid series of changes in plan, management, credits, none of which dimmed L'Enfant's creation, though full recognition was not to come in his lifetime.

The work of the plan for the Federal City was then placed in charge of Andrew Ellicott, the surveyor, who was appointed by President Washington to survey the "ten miles square." Nevertheless, we find that the executed plan of the Federal City, as redrawn and signed by Ellicott, departs but little from the modified L'Enfant Plan. The changes are perhaps an improvement on the layout as modified by President Washington. Both the L'Enfant and the so-called Ellicott plans show the northern boundary line of the city in a curved form, following, it is thought—at least in part—an old road extending from Georgetown to Bladensburg, and thus the Boundary Street became the curved Florida Avenue of today. In comparing the two plans it is also to be noted that L'Enfant's Plan shows no names of streets or avenues, while the so-called "Ellicott Plan" names the avenues and numbers the squares. The width of streets and avenues is the same as in the L'Enfant Plan. The Columbia Historical Society has this to say regarding this first appearance of Ellicott's name on the map of the plan: "The explanatory reference on L'Enfant's 1792 Philadelphia engraving, in which Ellicott's name is given, was placed there by L'Enfant, who placed his own name in its legend, stating, 'By Peter Charles L'Enfant.' By withholding the legend, and continuing the reference, assistant Ellicott has been honored at the expense of his superior, and confirming that honor by placing the same reference on his own Boston engraving."

Ellicott, having taken charge of the Surveying Department in

March, 1792, under the District Commissioners, had five assistant surveyors, namely, his two brothers Benjamin and Joseph Ellicott, Isaac Briggs, George Fenwick, and James R. Dermott, all of whom were discharged because of inaccurate surveying. Ellicott was succeeded by the same James R. Dermott who exposed the errors to the Commissioners. Dermott resigned in 1798, and was succeeded by Robert King, Senior, and he by another Robert King, brother of Nicholas King. All of these made individual maps of the plan, as did DeKraft in 1833 and William Eliot in 1837. Each of them made his plots and maps. Whatever the divergencies, all were versions of L'Enfant's Plan.

During many years Washington grew slowly and haphazardly. We may say that with the administration of John Quincy Adams in 1829 and the passing of the generation that knew President Washington, the L'Enfant Plan seemed generally forgotten. In 1800, when Washington became the seat of government, there were in the city 109 brick houses and 263 frame houses. The two leading structures were the Capitol and the President's House. Pennsylvania Avenue, connecting the two buildings, was laid out in 1797 and for years was a deep morass covered with alder bushes. Jefferson manifested his interest in the avenue by improving it and planting two rows of poplar trees on either side. It was at the suggestion of Jefferson, approved by Washington, that the classical style of architecture was chosen for public buildings, as exhibited in the Capitol and the President's House, and this style of architecture was adhered to by President Jackson in adopting the classical design for the Treasury Department, the old Patent Office, and the old Post Office Building.

The question of compensation to Major L'Enfant arose several times. In a letter from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to President Washington, dated October 21, 1791, they stated:

From several intimations, we consider the business as resting more on us than heretofore; this is an additional motive for us to wish a clear understanding of the terms on which Major L'Enfant renders his assistance. We therefore requested him today to mention to us the sum by the year, excluding the time past, which would be satisfactory for his service, or if it was not his choice, tho' not so agreeable to us, we would propose the

sum. We intended Six hundred pounds, but Major L'Enfant desired to be excused from entering on the subject for the present. . . .

On March 6, 1792, the Secretary of State wrote from Philadelphia to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia: ". . . It is now proper that he should receive the reward of his past services, and the wish that he should have no just cause of discontent suggests that it should be liberal. The President thinks of 2,500 or 3,000 dollars, but leaves the determination to you. . . ."

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia replied they had adopted the President's ideas of "five hundred guineas and a Lot in a good part of the city." Thereupon the Commissioners wrote the following letter to L'Enfant, on March 14, 1792:

We have been notified that we are no longer to consider you as engaged in the business of the Federal City. Notwithstanding this event, we wish to convince you that it is not our intention that your past services should be unrecompensed. You will therefore receive from Messrs. Cunningham and Nisbett of Philadelphia, five hundred guineas, whenever it may suit you to apply for it. Besides the above sum, we will make over to you a lot in the City of Washington near the President's House, or Capitol, as you may choose.

To that letter, L'Enfant replied as follows: ". . . Without enquiring of the principle upon which you rest this offer, I shall only here testify my surprise thereupon, as also my intention to decline accepting of it.—in testimony of which I hasten expressing to you my wish and request that you will recall back your order to *Cunningham and Nesbit* for the money & not take any trouble about the lot."

Thus the question of L'Enfant's compensation was left unsettled. But it was not the last word on the subject. In subsequent years L'Enfant appeared frequently at the doors of Congress, setting forth his claims in memorials and defending the plan of the city. In 1800 appeared L'Enfant's first memorial to the President and to Congress stating his claim and asking a settlement. In this document, reported adversely on December 24, 1802, L'Enfant mentions in detail the various items in his bill against the government as follows: "For his labor for one year \$8,000; for the profit he had a right to receive from the sale of maps, \$37,500; and the further sum of \$50,000,

to use the petitioner's own expression, 'for perquisites of right in particular negotiations and enterprise.' The total claim amounted to \$95,500."

It is evident that the offer made to him in 1792 of about \$2,500 was considered to be entirely inadequate by him and therefore his artistic nature constrained him to decline it. On March 4, 1804, a bill became a law, which in one of its sections authorized the superintendent of the city to settle and pay L'Enfant's claim "In the manner and on the terms heretofore proposed, by the said Commission." But as L'Enfant was in debt, it seems a creditor secured a judgment and levied on the money L'Enfant was supposed to receive.

The history of the claim apparently was closed by a bill which became law in 1810, appropriating the sum of \$666.66 with interest from March 1, 1792, to pay L'Enfant for services in laying out a plan of the city. The total amount received by L'Enfant under this act was \$1,394.20.

The neglect of the plan led to departures from it and errors which have been impossible to rectify. The Treasury Department Building was placed directly in the line of Pennsylvania Avenue, thus obstructing the vista from the Capitol to the President's House. L'Enfant had planned this to be an open vista. The Smithsonian Building, begun in 1846, projects into the Mall area. At about the same time gardens were established at the head of the Mall near the Capitol. A half century later these proved to be one of the great obstacles in the restoration of the L'Enfant Plan.

A further difficulty manifested itself through neglect of the plan when disputes arose as to street boundaries, and the integrity of the plan was questioned. This happened in three particular cases that came before the Supreme Court of the United States. The need for accurate data inaugurated researches into the history of the long-neglected L'Enfant Plan, directed by the Attorney General. The Court published in 1887 a picture of the L'Enfant Plan as changed by Ellicott and a portion of the Dermott map in its report on the case. Also, the Coast and Geodetic Survey Office completed a reproduction of the L'Enfant Plan as we have it today, and printed an explanatory statement on the map as follows: "A tracing for preservation and reproduction has been completed of the original

manuscript plan of the City of Washington which was prepared by Peter Charles L'Enfant in the year 1791 under the authority of President Washington."

In 1900 the celebration of the centennial of the removal of the seat of government from Philadelphia to Washington gave impulse to a study of the entire District of Columbia for the purpose of restoring the unity, good order, and elegance which had originally been planned for it in 1791. The result was the McMillan Park Commission Plan of 1901, which reaffirmed, enlarged, and adapted the century-old plan for the entire District of Columbia. Much has been written concerning that plan, known also as the Senate Park Commission Plan, because authorization for the preparation of it was given by the United States Senate, pursuant to a resolution introduced by Senator James McMillan, of Michigan, Chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and adopted by the Senate on March 8, 1901.

On March 19, 1901, the subcommittee of the District Committee met the representatives of the American Institute of Architects and agreed to their proposition that Daniel H. Burnham, architect of Chicago, and Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., landscape architect, of Brookline, Massachusetts, be selected as experts with power to add to their number. These gentlemen accepted the task and subsequently invited Charles F. McKim, architect, and Augustus Saint-Gaudens, sculptor, of New York City, to act with them in the preparation of plans. The services of men who had won the very highest places in their several professions had thus been secured. Their several efforts produced an awakening of the American people to the necessity for securing a higher degree of civic beauty, and now the first American city to feel the impulse of that awakening was Washington.

The nature and scope of the work having been outlined to the Commission, they entered upon their task, but not without hesitation and misgivings. The problem was both difficult and complex. Much had to be done and much also had to be undone. Then, too, the aid and advice of the Commission were sought immediately in relation to buildings and memorials under consideration. The Commission, in order to make a closer study of the practice of landscape architecture, as applied to parks and public buildings, made a brief

trip to Europe, visiting Rome, Venice, Vienna, Budapest, Paris, London, and their suburbs.

These plans constituted the first notable proposal for the grouping of public buildings ever put forward in the United States. The outlying sections of the District of Columbia were studied in relation to a system of parks, both large and small areas being indicated; the most convenient and the most picturesque connections between the various parks were mapped; the individual treatment which each important park should undergo was recommended; an extension of the park system to Great Falls and to Mount Vernon was discussed. Primarily, however, the development of the Mall received detailed and elaborate treatment, and the location of new public buildings, whether legislative, executive, or municipal in character, was arranged according to a rational system of grouping; and those memorials which mark distinct epochs in our national history were brought into harmonious relation with the general scheme of development. As a result of this study, the desirability of making every considerable undertaking within the District of Columbia a part of a general plan was made evident, so that each undertaking should contribute its part to enhancing the value of the whole; and no undertaking would be allowed to invade, to mutilate, or to mar the symmetry, simplicity, and the dignity of the one great composition designed to comprehend the entire area.

One of the greatest obstacles to a restoration of the Mall as provided for in the L'Enfant Plan was the fact that since 1872 the Mall had been occupied by railroad tracks, the Board of Aldermen and the Board of Common Council having on March 20, 1871, granted the Mall site to the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company, later the Pennsylvania Railroad Company. This action was confirmed by an act of Congress, May 21, 1872. The Mall was then no better than a common pasture. The railroad had taken the place of the canal, which it paralleled, and held the right to use the property by a title, good in law and in equity; also by virtue of an act of Congress adopted in 1890, the railroad space had been enlarged in consideration of the surrender of street trackage and the proposed elevation of the tracks within the city of Washington. Fortunately, Mr. Burnham, who was the architect for a new Pennsylvania Railroad Station, reached an agreement with the president of the com-

pany, Mr. Cassatt, under which the company agreed to join the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company in building a Union Station north of the Capitol Building, with Congress contributing the expense of a tunnel to connect with the South. Thus the first of the obstacles in the restoration of the L'Enfant Plan was removed. The second, the relocation of the Botanic Garden at the foot of the Capitol, involved questions of vested rights considered by Congress in the course of prolonged legislation.

Other prominent features of the Plan of 1901 were the location of a memorial to Abraham Lincoln, the extension of the Mall axis three-fourths of a mile to the banks of the Potomac (where also provision was made for locating the Arlington Memorial Bridge), the reclaiming of 640 acres of Potomac Park lands, and the establishment of a parkway to the northwest section of the city through a ravine separating Georgetown and Washington. The Mall and White House axes, which were ignored in locating the Washington Monument in 1846, were restored. Also many plans were made for a parkway to encircle the city. Also many other features were suggested. Recently the writer had occasion to confer with the Secretary of the McMillan Park Commission of 1901, Dr. Charles Moore, concerning the cost of the Plan of 1901, and it was ascertained that this cost amounted to \$64,000. The Plan of 1901, which reaffirmed and restored the L'Enfant Plan, has been at the basis of the development of Washington since that year.

The great Public Buildings Program of 1926, for which Congress made \$400,000,000 available, was planned to conform to the L'Enfant Plan and the Plan of 1901. A prominent feature in this work was the development of the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue between the Capitol and the Treasury Department Building. Seventy acres were purchased for eight large department buildings.

In 1926 Congress also created the National Capital Park and Planning Commission "with the duty of preparing, developing and maintaining a comprehensive, consistent, and coordinated plan for the National Capital and environs (an area of some 1,539 square miles), lying within 20 miles of the White House, and involving the cooperation of two States, four counties, two cities, and numerous incorporated places . . ., including traffic and transportation prob-

lems, plats and subdivisions, highways, parks and parkways, playgrounds, and other elements of city and regional planning."

Thus, the dreams of Washington, Jefferson and L'Enfant are being realized in the establishment of the Federal City and in the realization of those projects that made for its upbuilding and development during the past one hundred and fifty years. The city today is recognized as the most beautiful in the United States.

L'Enfant lived to be seventy-one years of age, and for many years rested in a neglected grave in the northeast section of the city, until 1909, when, by authority of Congress, his remains were brought to the Rotunda of the Capitol to receive the tribute of the nation. Thence they were taken to the brow of Arlington National Cemetery, from which his tomb overlooks the city he planned.

THE AMERICAN FARMER IN A CHANGING WORLD

HARRY J. CARMAN AND CARL T. SCHMIDT

CULTIVATORS of the earth are the most valuable of citizens. They are the most vigorous, the most independent, the most virtuous, and they are tied to their country and wedded to its liberty and interests by the most lasting bonds. . . . Those who labor in the earth are the chosen people of God." Thus spoke Thomas Jefferson more than a century ago. Rather than build great cities with their exploitative captains of industry and exploited proletariat, he would keep America agrarian. Countless men of affairs have repeated his wish. Even today, in a predominantly urban America, we still hear it said—perhaps with more vehemence than assurance—that the farming community is the nation's backbone. The aspirant to high political office still does well to point to his rural background or at least to insist on his love for farmers and farm life. And when we think of "typical Americans" we still think, not of people in New York or San Francisco or St. Louis, but of people on farms in Iowa or Vermont or Wisconsin.

The high regard in which the American farmer has been held is not hard to understand. For a long time, America was primarily rural. And the notion prevailed that American characteristics—both virtues and weaknesses—were the characteristics of our free rural folk. The promise of American life was embodied in the pioneer farmers, in the self-reliant men and women who struck out in a rich land and by dint of hard work, simple living, and minding their own business, got ahead in the world. The independent farmer, idealized perhaps, but nevertheless having a good deal of reality, was the prototype of the successful American, the main character in the American dream. He was regarded as the mainstay of individualism, the guardian of liberty and democracy, the inheritor of America's future. The "family farm"—owned outright by the family that occupied it; not too large to be operated by the farmer, his wife and children, and perhaps a hired man; not too small to provide the family with a secure and comfortable living—was regarded as the foundation of the American social order.

But today there is a wide gap between ideal and reality. The Jeffersonian dream of a democratic America rooted in the rugged individualism and sturdy independence of millions of simple, unpretentious farming families, has not come to pass. Today millions of America's rural men and women are without security. Indeed, great numbers of farmers and farm workers have no more material security than the poorest of city dwellers. The historic America of the farm has become increasingly overshadowed by the forces of industrialism, and agriculture as a way of life has become increasingly more difficult.

Although our farm population has become an ever smaller part of our total population, it is still large. Almost thirty-two million people were living on nearly seven million farms in 1935. About half lived in the South, 40 per cent in the North, and less than 10 per cent in eleven states of the Far West. One out of five gainfully occupied persons in the United States is employed in agriculture. In ten states those engaged in farming still constitute over 40 per cent of all the gainfully employed.

Of course, there are wide variations in the character of our farmers. We have, for example, agriculturists specializing in cotton, grain, poultry, fruit, and dairy products. There also are many "general," "self-sufficing," and "part-time" farmers. Furthermore, there are significant differences in the output of individual farms. If all farms in 1929 are divided into two groups—first, those producing more than \$1,000 worth of products, including goods consumed by the farm family, and, secondly, those producing less than \$1,000 worth—we find that the first group, comprising about 51 per cent of all farms, produced 89 per cent of all the farm commodities sold in 1929. Even more striking, the farmers whose individual output exceeded \$2,500 constituted only 19 per cent of all farmers. Yet their production amounted to more than three fifths of all the farm products marketed. These are our commercial farmers, in the full sense of the term. They are also the politically powerful farmers. The less productive group—49 per cent of all farmers—produced only 11 per cent of all products sold and 42 per cent of all products consumed by farm families. (Since 1929, the commercial output of this poorer half of our farms has dropped still further.) Two thirds are in the South. They are the economically and politically sub-

merged half of our farmers. Most rural poverty and destitution is found among these people and among agricultural laborers. But their birth rate is high, and their descendants will be an ever-increasing proportion of our future citizens.

Most farms in America are family farms. To be sure, in certain regions—as in California and parts of the South—large-scale, professionally managed farm establishments are common. But the majority of the nation's farms still fit into the American ideal in the sense of management and operation by a single family.

However, in the matter of ownership by the operating family—another essential of our tradition—we have departed considerably from the ideal. With the passing years, more and more farmers have slipped out of the class of owner-operators. Of every hundred persons working in agriculture at the beginning of 1935, 52 were "operators," that is, managing heads of farms. Only 24 of these 52, however, were owners of all the land they farmed. Six were part-owners, and the remaining 22 were tenants. But 6 of the 22 tenants were share-croppers in the South, and therefore "tenants" only by courtesy of the census. Actually, share-croppers are a peculiar kind of farm labor. Thirteen of the hundred persons were hired laborers. Finally, 35 persons were unpaid family workers—wives, children or other relatives of the operator.

Not even all farmers who own their land are so close to the American ideal as might be thought at first glance. Very many of them are so heavily indebted to banks, insurance companies, the federal government, and other creditors, as to be only nominally independent. They are virtually paying rent for land, the debts on which they cannot liquidate. A little over 40 per cent of all owner-operated farms in 1935 were mortgaged, and the mortgage debt amounted on the average to about half the value of the land and buildings on these farms. Certainly not all mortgaged farmers are in distress. But when the interest payments begin to weigh down on the farmer, he is induced to wring a little more income out of his farm, neglecting the soil and buildings and lowering the living standards of his family. Unquestionably, the increase in mortgage debt during the past thirty years is one sign of the growing insecurity of our farmers.

More than 40 per cent of the farm operators in the United States today are tenants of one kind or another. And this is further

evidence of rural insecurity. True, under certain conditions tenancy need not be harmful. But most farm tenancy is detrimental both to tenants and to the country. The year-to-year lease is prevalent throughout the United States. Moreover, most tenancy contracts are little more than oral agreements. Consequently, misunderstandings between landlord and tenant arise more frequently than would be likely under carefully drafted and written leases. The short life and uncertain character of farm leases contribute to the marked instability of tenants peculiar to this country. In 1935, for example, almost half of all tenants had occupied their farms for one year or less. But only one tenth of the owner-operators had been on the same farm for so short a period. Such instability has serious effects on farm management and on the lives of the tenant families. Tenants who cannot look farther ahead than the end of the year are not likely to make improvements on farms where they temporarily find themselves. In fact, they rarely have a legal right to compensation for improvements they may make in soil fertility, fences, roads, ditches, drains, terraces, water supply, and the like. It is not surprising, then, that many tenants not only make no effort to improve the rented farm, but even let it deteriorate. The following conversation, told by Rupert B. Vance, illustrates the point:

Farm Tenant: "How about fixing that leaky roof over at the place?"

His Landlord: "Why ask me to fix it?"

Tenant: "Well, it's your place, ain't it?"

Landlord: "Yes, but it's leaking on you."

Tenant: "Well, it won't be next year."

Although tenancy is associated largely with staple crops it is found in all parts of the country. About 65 per cent of all farmers in the Cotton Belt are share-tenants and share-croppers; about 48 and 45 per cent are tenants in the tobacco areas and Corn Belt, respectively. Roughly two thirds of all tenants, including croppers, are in the South. Mississippi, with 70 per cent of its farms operated by tenants and croppers, leads all the states, but Georgia, South Carolina, Alabama, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Oklahoma are not far behind. About half the farms in Iowa, often thought of as the heart of "independent" rural America, are tenant-operated. Nor is tenancy a new development in the United States. It was first reported in

the Census of 1880, when one fourth of the four million farms then in the country were found to be tenant-operated. During the fifty-five years from 1880 to 1935, the number of tenants increased by 180 per cent, whereas the number of farms operated by nontenants rose only 32 per cent. In more recent times, about 40,000 new tenants have been added to the total each year.

When we review the growth of farm debt and the glacier-like drift toward tenancy during the past two generations, we must come to the conclusion that our farmers are losing ownership of the land. In good times as in bad, the proportion of all farm real estate actually belonging to the cultivating farmers has been steadily shrinking. In 1880 their equity constituted about 62 per cent of the value of all farm real estate in the United States. In 1890 it was about 59 per cent; in 1900, 54 per cent; in 1910, 50 per cent; in 1920, 46 per cent; in 1930, 42 per cent; and in 1935, only 39 per cent. It is in the most highly commercialized regions—in the Cotton, Corn, and Wheat Belts—that farmers own the smallest proportions of the land. In Illinois, Iowa, and South Dakota—states settled by homesteaders not very long ago—the equity of operating farmers has been reduced to less than a third of the value of land and buildings. We can almost say that the newer and more productive the soil, the less it belongs to the people who cultivate it. More and more, our farmers have had to share the incomes from farms with landlords and creditors.

This situation is the rural counterpart of the growing gap between workmanship and ownership in urban industry. Certainly it runs directly counter to the Jeffersonian ideal of a democracy based on a mass of independent, property-owning farmers. It contradicts the American tradition of opportunity for every self-reliant man. But is it more than just a denial of traditions? Must the loss of ownership by our farmers of necessity injure them and all the rest of the country? Certainly it need not always and under all conditions lead to poor farming and poor living. But in a wider sense, the loss of property is the loss of economic and political power and of social prestige. Furthermore, it means a lessening of interest in preservation of the land, the family, and the rural community. And this is to be deplored.

How do our farmers live? Just as there is a great variety of

farm enterprises, so too there are wide differences in the living conditions of rural people. Many farm families live comfortably as regards food, clothes, and housing. Some of them enjoy cultural and recreational opportunities to a surprising degree, thanks largely to the automobile, radio, and telephone. Then, too, farmers have non-material compensations that are denied most people living in cities. Such satisfactions as come from running your own business instead of being bossed by someone else, owning land and a home, knowing your neighbors, having pride in craftsmanship, and living close to the earth under sun and clouds, count for a good deal.

But the kind of life that most rural people live depends mainly on their incomes, just as is true of city people. A study of family incomes shows that perhaps a third to a half of our farm population does not enjoy a decent and secure living. And many are in extreme poverty, measured by any standard. Let us look at some data that show what bleak lives many of these people must lead. In 1929, a year remembered as prosperous for the country as a whole, nearly half of the farms produced less than \$1,000 worth of goods, including goods consumed on the farm. Worse still, about 1,800,000 farm families had less than \$600, and almost a million, mostly in the South, did not make \$400. Moreover, the average income from farmwork of the 2,700,000 agricultural laborers in 1929 was only \$360. Even if we allow for outside earnings of some families, it is plain that in the 1920's millions of our rural people had appallingly little. Remember that the incomes of farmers had to cover not only living but also farm-operating expenses. Surely the living conditions of the men, women, and children on farms producing less than \$400 were far below our notion of "a decent American standard." O. E. Baker, an outstanding student of rural life, points out that the farmer whose income is less than \$400 "is approaching the Chinese level of production."

The onrush of depression after 1929 swept many farm people into even deeper poverty, at least for a time. Farmers who had never imagined that they would need outside assistance found themselves helpless victims of conditions they could not possibly control. According to a study made by the National Resources Committee, 27.7 per cent of the *nonrelief* farm families had incomes of less than \$500 in the year ending June, 1936 (a year of partial recovery from

the depression), and 34.6 per cent had between \$500 and \$1,000. ("Income" includes the value of food, housing, and other goods consumed directly on the farm.) But of *all* nonrelief families in the United States, urban and rural, 10.6 per cent received less than \$500, and 24.7 per cent received from \$500 to \$1,000. That is, farm people are conspicuously massed in the lower income levels.

These data represent average conditions throughout the country. But in particular regions, as in the Deep South, farm communities are so far below the average as to make them the worst slums of America. People in these rural slums become so crushed as to lose the incentive for improving their lot. "What's the use?" they ask, "We don't get nothin' but a livin' nohow." Poor farmers make poor soil, and poor soil results in even poorer farmers.

By February, 1935, more than a million farm families were on federal relief or rehabilitation rolls. This was indeed something new in American history. When, back in the seventies and nineties, farmers suffered from serious depressions, they managed to help themselves with little outside aid. But in the thirties the safety-valve of opportunity in the towns or on farms farther west was gone. Moreover, agriculture is much more largely operating on a mechanized and highly commercial basis than in earlier times, and this binds the destiny of millions of farmers closely to the ups and downs of their cash purchasing power.

In times past many farm families were poor, but they could generally look forward to a better day for themselves or their children. It is not so much the present rural poverty as it is the gloomy outlook for so many farm folk that is the really sharp contrast between farming today and farming a generation ago. To be sure, there were years of distress then too, occasioned by drought or low prices. But the country kept on expanding and our cotton, wheat, and meatstuffs were supreme in world trade. Values of farm land rose year by year, and that was a boon to many farmers. Even if they could not become rich by selling their farm products, they could at least count on liquidating their debts eventually by selling the land at good prices. All in all, the outlook for farmers in those days seemed bright.

Why, then, have so many of our farm people in more recent times been sinking into an economic and social mire? Why has ag-

riculture as a way of life and as a business been less inviting during the last twenty years? Why, despite costly farm relief efforts, does the long-run prospect for great numbers of our staple-crop farmers seem so unpromising? No complete answer can be given in brief compass, but it is possible to point to a number of basic forces that have been making for a decline of American agriculture. The great depression after 1929 certainly does not offer us the explanation—it merely increased the pressure of forces already at work long before 1929. Indeed, they continue to underlie the course of agriculture even now, after a decade of far-flung efforts by our federal government to solve the farmer's problems.

For one thing, most farm enterprise is a small-scale, highly competitive pursuit. But it is caught in a web of big business. Our billion acres of agricultural land are split up among nearly seven million separate farms. And most of these farms are relatively small, single-family holdings. Even the "great" cotton plantation or wheat ranch is not big by comparison with the typical steel mill or automobile factory. Except in a few areas, genuinely large-scale and corporate farming in the United States is still unimportant. Nor has it yet proved itself decisively more efficient than small-scale farming. The point is that, because of the fiercely competitive nature of his own business, the ordinary farmer has no control over the prices of his commodities. He produces as much as he can, and sells for whatever he gets.

The situation is very different for most of those who buy from or sell to the farmer. In their case, efficiency demands large-scale operation, and this in turn means fewer firms in each market and therefore increased managerial control over prices. Thus when the farmer sells his wheat, or tobacco, or milk, or when he ships his goods by rail, he is confronted by big business. Again, he runs into big business when he buys fertilizer, or a tractor, or a refrigerator, or when he borrows money. In 1934, for example, three big tobacco manufacturers bought 46 per cent of the total tobacco crop in this country, thirteen flour millers purchased 65 per cent of the commercial wheat crop, three meat packers bought 41 per cent of the marketed cattle and 25 per cent of the hogs, two milk distributors bought 13 per cent of the commercial milk. Thus, quite apart from the possibility of deliberate monopolistic price-rigging by business, the

farmer is likely to be in a weak bargaining position both as seller and buyer. Here is one reason why the prices he receives are so much less certain than the prices he pays. It helps to explain the low purchasing power of the farmer. And it is also a reason why, when his prices slip downward, the individual farmer finds that he must go right on producing as much as ever, perhaps even more. Without machinery to eliminate cutthroat competition and to adjust production to changing market conditions, the American farmer is penalized by being an old-style operator in a streamlined world of big business.

Furthermore, to the extent that big business contributes to the instability of our entire economy—and there are reasons to believe it does—the farmer is even more seriously injured. After all, he depends primarily on the wage earners in industry and commerce to buy his surplus products. If their incomes fall because of wage cuts and unemployment he is hard hit. Moreover, widespread unemployment makes it almost impossible for a farmer or his children to quit even a very unprofitable farm by taking work in town. And, of course, this is one reason for the slowness with which our agriculture is adjusting itself to changed conditions.

Secondly, since the end of the World War the farmer has seen his foreign market ebb away. Following the repeal of the English Corn Laws in 1846 and the advent of cheap transportation, exports of agricultural products from the United States rose steadily. The rapid growth of industrial population abroad greatly enlarged the market for low-priced American foodstuffs and cotton. For half a century these increased European requirements were largely supplied by the expanding tillage of the vast Mississippi Basin. But with the disappearance of cheap fertile lands in the United States, the American farmer began to lose his superiority in the world market. Wheat and livestock producers in other areas with great reserves of fertile land—such as Canada, Argentina, Australia—were able because of lower costs to undersell the American products. Even cotton—long a virtual American monopoly and our most important agricultural export—has not escaped the competition of other lands. Our tobacco, fruits, and other farm commodities are being squeezed out of world markets by the stiff competition of products that have the advantage of lower production costs or preferential treatment by various governments. In broad perspective, this tendency is to be

seen as a concomitant of America's industrialization, its decreased dependence on foreign capital and manufactured goods, its growing ability to export industrial goods.

A major handicap for American farmers in more recent years has grown out of extreme doctrines of nationalism. Practically every country of the Old World, gripped by a sense of insecurity, has tried to become more nearly self-sufficient in its food supply. Increased attention has been given to maintaining or even increasing rural populations. This policy rests partly on sentimental grounds and partly on social, political, and military considerations. A large rural community is regarded not only as a source of essential foodstuffs in wartime but also as a bulwark against revolutionary tendencies so apt to take root in cities with their growing propertyless classes. Part of the drive toward self-sufficiency, too, has sprung from retaliation by one country against trade and immigration barriers erected by other countries. Our own economic nationalism, expressed in high tariff rates during the post-war years, contributed no little to the difficulties. We made it harder for foreigners to exchange their manufactured goods for our agricultural products and thus compelled them to turn to our competitors for their foodstuffs.

All in all, then, the United States can no longer regard itself as the granary and the cattle ranch of the world, and its exports of food and fibers seem destined, except perhaps in time of war, to continue to decline in importance. In 1914 we exported 20 per cent of our wheat, 63 per cent of our cotton, 47 per cent of our tobacco, 48 per cent of our lard. In 1929 these percentages were 18, 55, 41, and 49, respectively; by 1935 they were down to 4, 50, 36, and 17. In 1938 they were still low: 10, 39, 36, and 12. As Secretary Wallace puts it: "In the peak years of the 1920's our farm exports required the production of over 80 million acres. They required the production of about 70 million acres during the five years before the depression. Since then they have required only the production of from 20 million to 50 million acres, mostly in cotton."

Thirdly, changes in domestic demand—gradual, but nevertheless potent—have tended to constrict profitable markets for many farmers. In former times, they could look to our rapidly growing population to take their surpluses. Now the persistent decline in the rate of population growth eliminates one important buttress of our agri-

culture. Indeed, if, as appears likely, the birth rate continues to fall and immigration remains small, the population will before many years cease growing. Eventually there may even be fewer mouths to feed and backs to clothe. Dietary changes, too—especially shifts from beef and cereals to milk, sugar, fruits, and vegetables—have already impaired the markets for commodities important to great numbers of farmers. Annual consumption of cereal foods, for example, declined about 100 pounds per capita during the 1920's. Moreover, producers of hay and grain have been hard hit during the last quarter of a century by the widespread substitution of tractors and automobiles for horses and mules.

Fourthly, the increasing mechanization of agriculture has intensified the problems of farm operators and their hired workers. During the course of the past hundred years, millions of new farms—supported by the liberal land, immigration, and transportation policies of a solicitous government—came into existence. But this development was more than an increase in the number of farmers and of acres cultivated. For it was accompanied, and indeed to a large degree made possible, by a remarkable rise in the efficiency of agricultural enterprise—resulting from the application of science to the arts of the husbandman. Here, again, the government has been a prime agent, for it constantly increased the scope of its agricultural research and its efforts to provide farmers with up-to-the-minute information. The work of the federal government has been supplemented by the state departments of agriculture and farm societies and journals. Always in the foreground has been the idea of "bigger and better" farm production. Urged on by these agencies and by the growing cost of farm labor, the desire to lessen the burden of hard work, the hope of profit, the American farmer has turned increasingly to mechanization, to scientific breeding and feeding, to more business-like methods of management. By 1929 the average farmer and farm laborer produced 150 per cent more than he did in 1870, and 37 per cent more than in 1909. The agricultural output in 1929 was 27 per cent bigger than in 1909, yet it was produced by 7.5 per cent fewer persons. Far fewer hired laborers are now needed in the Western wheat regions than twenty or thirty years ago, and the corn harvester has reduced the number required in the Corn Belt. Plowing, planting, fertilizing, cultivating—all are being mechanized. And

the all-purpose tractor is eliminating countless backbreaking chores. In the past, labor released from agriculture by the machine could find employment in urban industry. Today that outlet is closed, and who knows when it will again be open? The mechanical cotton-picker will one day greatly curtail the need for workers in the cotton fields. What then will become of thousands on thousands of Southern farm folk?

From the standpoint of *potential* farm production, the results of these developments are even more remarkable. In 1929, as we have seen, half our farmers produced 89 per cent of the total commercial output of American agriculture. No doubt these farmers could easily produce the remaining 11 per cent if prices offered them only a little encouragement. That is, the less productive half of our farmers are not needed to feed and clothe the nonfarm people. Instead of population pressing on the means of subsistence, as Thomas Malthus prophesied, agriculture is now pressing on population. Mechanization has changed the whole technical basis of farming, making millions of small farms obsolete and incapable of competing on any "reasonable" basis with more efficient farms. Yet so long as the less productive farmer's cash income barely covers his out-of-pocket expenses, he finds it better to go on producing than to stop altogether. By pulling in his belt, lowering the living standards of his family, and neglecting the long-run needs of his farm he can continue to compete—on a cutthroat basis—with technically superior farms.

The constant pressure of agricultural supplies on demand is, then, a further basic reason for the economic weaknesses of our farmers. Technological achievements have made available a potential source of additional quantities of agricultural goods that, in the absence of control, must flood the markets whenever prices remain for any length of time on even a modestly attractive level.

Yet, in the opinion of many authorities, farm mechanization is as yet only in its infancy. They look forward to a day when most important farm jobs will be performed by machines. They also foresee a future when, through the researches of the agrobiologist, crop yields per acre will be multiplied many times. Unless the chemists can discover tremendous outlets for farm products as raw materials for industry, then millions of our farmers must leave the land or be subsidized by the government or be doomed to chronic

poverty. Even those who believe that we have far too many farmers must hesitate to advocate a wholesale shift of rural people to towns and cities. For that would merely result in still more outright unemployment. Perhaps the possibilities of cityward migration will improve, but how soon and how rapidly no one knows.

Finally, it is obvious that the extremes of rural distress are not to be explained solely by market conditions, by the movement of farm prices and costs. After all, many of the poorest farm people produce very little for market. Behind their troubles lie broader social and physical factors. Almost a million farm families live on farms that are so small, or on lands so poor, that they cannot make a satisfactory living. In the Cotton Belt, poverty is bred by the tenant and cropper systems, high birth rates, class cleavages, and racial prejudices. In the Appalachian area, about 40 per cent of the farms are less than 50 acres in size, and cultivation is generally restricted by the rough and sterile land. Here, also, illiteracy and high birth rates make for poor living. But such impoverished farmers are by no means confined to the Deep South and the Southern highlands. There are also wretchedly poor farm people in the fertile Midwest, the dry wheat regions, the Southwest, the Lake States, Florida, and the Pacific Northwest. And some of the most abject people in the world live in the shadows of California's magnificent mountains and forests.

Thus, in broad perspective, we can see that our farmers have been drawn into the vortex of industrialism. They, too, share the insecurities brought to our society by the machine. It was the cotton, wheat, and corn, produced at low cost on the virtually free and highly fertile lands of America that provided cheap food and clothing to the West European peoples and so helped them to turn from farming to manufacturing. Moreover, our agricultural exports enabled us to import much of the capital with which our own urban industrialism was built. And when this job was done the American farmers were left stranded in an uncertain world. Their pre-eminence in foreign markets has vanished, and the application of machines to agriculture has made needless the work of many farmers in supplying even our own requirements. At the same time, industrialism has been unable to use all its own great capacities. This has meant urban poverty and unemployment, which in turn have brought poverty

and disguised unemployment to the farms. As we near the middle of the twentieth century, we find that millions of farm workers have no more material security than the poorest city people. Our farm problems are basically the problems of an industrial society that has not yet learned to use its resources wisely and humanely.

Clearly, rural poverty is a danger not only to farm people but also to everyone in the nation. We can appreciate what is at stake when we recall that the birth rate is highest in the very areas where rural living conditions are worst. According to O. E. Baker, 1,000 farm people will have three to seven times as many descendants a century hence as 1,000 people living in our large cities. Most Americans a hundred years from now will be the offspring of the rural people of today. Here, surely, is the highest justification for a national policy designed to wipe out rural slums and raise the living levels of our farm families. Unless the conditions that produce rural insecurity are attacked and overcome, not only will much of our present generation be condemned to lives of destitution, but also a large proportion of the Americans of the future will be reared against a background of material and spiritual poverty. The farm must not only be a place where cotton and wheat and corn are grown. It must also be a producer of men, of good citizens.

It is the fashion nowadays to talk about menaces to democracy. Yet it is no idle rhetoric to say that the problems of farmers are of vital importance in the building of our citizenship and of our democratic institutions. For democracy means more than political formulas. It can live only if it is brought down to the earth of common men, giving them security and a vital part in the affairs of political and industrial government. The men with little or no hope of jobs in our cities, and the depressed and virtually unemployed men of our countryside—all are a menace to democracy. Our people—and we are speaking now of those who have caught some glimpses of the American dream, not merely of those who have been congenitally impoverished—will not always submit to the conditions from which they have been suffering. If they come to realize that the dream of a democracy which promises security and good living is but an idle phantasy, then they may well turn to other gospels—gospels that will destroy democratic ways of life even though they may not bring well-being.

THE PLIGHT OF PUERTO RICO

MARY WILHELMINE WILLIAMS

PUERTO RICO is the Ireland of the United States, the worst headache resulting from our imperialistic adventures of the last half century. When the American troops under General Miles advanced into the Island in 1898, probably the majority of the population welcomed them, and some of the most enthusiastic carpeted with flowers the paths of the invaders. These were apparently more than satisfied with the prospect of living permanently under the Stars and Stripes. Others of the happy folk expected the conquerors to give them independence, which had already been pledged to Cuba. But there was a sturdy minority, made up largely of more recent arrivals from Spain and many of the Island's socially élite, which was far from pleased over the turn of affairs. Recently the mother country had made beneficial economic concessions, and late in 1897 she had granted the Puerto Ricans autonomy. Though this extension of political power had not been fully put into effect when the army of General Miles came marching in, the loyalists had been hopeful of better days under the Spanish flag. Unfortunately for them, the treaty which ended hostilities gave Puerto Rico to the United States as indemnity of war, with no pledge as to its political future. "We were handed over like cattle," was the bitter comment of some of the loyalists regarding the transfer.

Today, more than four decades after the conquest, although the inhabitants have been given a larger degree of self-rule, the permanent political status of the Island is still unsettled. The present form of government was authorized by the Jones Act of 1917, and is of advanced territorial character, similar to that of most of our states before admission to the Union. The bicameral legislature is elected by the people; the governor, attorney-general, auditor, and commissioner of education, and the five judges who constitute the supreme court are appointed by the president with the consent of the senate; but the commissioners of labor, health, agriculture, and commerce, and of the interior are appointed by the governor. These heads of departments, with the attorney-general, auditor, and com-

missioner of education, form the governor's cabinet. Cases may be appealed from the highest court of the Island to the Circuit Court of Boston, and thence to the Supreme Court of the United States. Since 1927, women as well as men have had the right of suffrage. Under the Jones Act, all Puerto Ricans are citizens of the United States. They are represented in Congress by a resident commissioner who may speak in their behalf, but may not vote.

The uncertainty as to their political future partly explains the unrest and discontent of the Islanders, who total about 1,800,000. But the basic cause of their physical woes is economic, and lies in their numbers; for they average about 520 people to the square mile. Since Puerto Rico is almost completely agricultural, this means that it is overpopulated. The fact that much of its surface is too mountainous for cultivation aggravates economic hardships. Large-scale unemployment has long been chronic; wages have been very low, with consequent wretched standards of living; and health conditions have been appalling. Gastrointestinal diseases, malaria, and hookworm are very prevalent, and the death rate from tuberculosis alone is about four and a half times that of the United States.

Under Spanish rule, much poverty and misery existed, but they appear to have become more general since 1898, partly because individuals or corporations from the United States have gained control of vast areas of arable land, in spite of legislation definitely aimed to prevent this. In 1900 Congress passed a law prohibiting anyone from holding more than 500 acres. Nonetheless, large tracts were acquired, so that at present four corporations own sugar plantations averaging 40,000 acres each. Many smaller estates exceed the legal maximum. In some instances the lawbreakers have tried to justify their conduct on the ground that the 500-acre limit is unreasonable, since the very expensive machinery needed for the sugar industry requires that large areas be worked by each planter to secure an adequate profit. Others have pretended to doubt the constitutionality of the law itself. As regards these large estates, the Island legislature—made up, it should be remembered, of Puerto Ricans—has itself been remiss; for it has neglected to implement the national law of 1900. Islanders who feel bitter over the monopoly by American capitalists hint that the latter have bribed key men in the legislature to forget the 500-acre limit. However, steps have been taken

recently to punish those who have violated it. The first case, which came before the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico in 1938, was decided in favor of the government; and the United States Supreme Court sustained the verdict. Even the humble peasants are somewhat blameworthy for the undemocratic land-distribution, since many of them sold their bits of soil to those who would pay a good price, regardless of the number of acres the purchaser might already have. Consequently, the proportion of people without land to raise food for themselves grew larger; wages, upon which the former small landholders were now entirely dependent for existence, became lower; and general wretchedness increased.

Sugar cane, the leading product, is grown on the coastal lowlands; coffee is the chief crop of the mountainous section of the west; and tobacco is the main product of the elevated portions of the east, where the large curing barns are conspicuous on the broad, fertile slopes. Direct food crops, such as maize and tropical fruits, are also cultivated; but they are of minor importance.

As was to be expected, the great depression of the past ten years hit Puerto Rico especially hard because of the Island's almost exclusive dependence upon agriculture. Death by starvation threatened many thousands of the inhabitants. Through going to the rescue, the United States Government gained much more awareness of Puerto Rico's distressing problems. Some blunders resulted, but also blessed help and hope where they were greatly needed. To raise sugar to a profitable price, the federal government placed cane-production on a quota basis, reducing the acreage considerably; but with dubious effects. Millions of dollars in direct relief were distributed, though this aid was less generous in proportion to population than that to any other American territory or to any of the states. The Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration, through projects for land-drainage, road-building, erection of workers' homes, public buildings, and the like, helped reduce unemployment. But such devices have no more solved this problem than they have ended it in continental United States. It is hoped, however, that this federal "lift" may stimulate in the people greater pride and public spirit and awaken to a fuller degree their initiative and capacity for leadership. Such a revival, combined with training in economic organization and co-ordination, and some additional financial aid for a time,

might send the Puerto Ricans far towards their goal of self-support at a decent standard of living.

As a direct contribution towards this end, the P.R.R.A. has been developing a twofold program: the distribution of land to the landless and the diversification of crops. Something over 40,000 acres of land had been put to enlightened use by the P.R.R.A. before the close of 1939; and a considerable fraction of this was obtained from absentee American owners. One large tract, the Central Lafayette, owned by Frenchmen, has been purchased and subdivided into farms of no more than 500 acres for the cultivation of cane. These farms are being worked by men united in co-operatives. Besides receiving wages for their work in the fields, the members of the co-operatives share in the profits from sugar production. Another tract, of more than 4,000 acres, formerly devoted to tobacco raising, was secured from an absentee continental corporation. But this area was subdivided by the P.R.R.A. into about 500 farms of from five to ten acres each and assigned to people carefully selected on the basis of character and ability. Each homesteader on these small tracts is supplied with livestock and a hurricane-proof cement house, and is allowed a long time to pay for the property. Through the P.R.R.A. he gets seeds and agricultural machinery at low cost. Tobacco is the main cash product of each little farm, but the family occupying it is expected to grow other crops for sale or for home use—such as sweet potatoes, bananas, maize, and beans, some of which can be planted on land used for tobacco after that crop has been harvested, and will mature before the next tobacco-planting is due. The small homesteaders may also add to their income by working for wages on the large adjoining farms. In the coffee region the federal government has likewise acquired land which has been subdivided into small farms for production of diversified crops. In other sections similar subdivision has taken place, in some cases, the individual holdings being only an acre in size. Some of the little farms are in semiurban parts, and are connected with slum-clearance projects of the P.R.R.A.

To insure its efforts against futility, the Administration has set up an inspection service to help the resettlers in their farming and homemaking, to see that they use properly the land allotted to them and that their substantial little houses are kept clean and sanitary.

When the P.R.R.A. program is completed, more than 12,000 of the new type of masonry houses will have been erected—an impressive object lesson for the peasants who live in the flimsy *bohíos* (huts of palm leaves or grasses).

Aside from the making of sugar and molasses, there is little manufacturing in the Island. Experts believe that elimination of unemployment and low standards of living, especially in the cities, can come only from extensive industrialization. Factories for producing various commodities used at home and abroad are needed; but the Puerto Ricans lack capital for launching such enterprises. The federal government could, however, do much toward helping them, especially through making some essential economic adjustments. Existing business establishments, such as banks, could also contribute a mite towards the solution of urban poverty by employing fewer continentals and more Islanders. Their failure to do so is a sore point in some of the cities.

The major nonagricultural occupation has long been the needlework done by the women of Puerto Rico, in the form of staple garments and of embroidery, beautiful in design and workmanship. About 50,000 are employed at needlecraft in the Island, but the center of the industry is Mayagüez, where most of the factories are found. As a rule, their work has been miserably paid, and, in the face of the financial need of the women, enforcement of the wages-and-hours law is reported to be especially difficult. The P.R.R.A. has, however, aided the craft through fostering high standards for quality and encouraging co-operation through the Puerto Rico Self-Help Corporation.

Another problem, resulting from the Island's poverty, is the fact that about half of the children of school age do not attend school, because educational facilities are quite inadequate. This situation has existed long, with the result that between 35 and 40 per cent of the people cannot read and write, a proportion of illiterates far in excess of even the most backward states of the Union. As a work relief project, the P.R.R.A., with funds matched by the insular legislature, has repaired many school buildings damaged by recent hurricanes and has constructed a number of new ones. But this has added only a few hundred classrooms, whereas about 5,000 more are needed, with teachers to preside over them.

Under the present economic set-up of Puerto Rico, it seems impossible to extend the educational facilities much further. Although federal income taxes are not collected in the Island, the financial levies on the population—all of which are spent at home—have nearly reached the limit of endurance, owing to the small per capita wealth. If the people are to attain a degree of literacy and intelligence comparable to even our least enlightened states, either the federal government must regularly furnish the money needed for additional schools and teachers or it must vigorously aid the Islanders to a new economy which will enable them to support an adequate educational system.

Akin to the educational question is the "English-language" problem, much agitated some years ago and still in existence. The law requires that English be taught in all the schools, though there is no prohibition against the use of Spanish by the population. But many who are unhappy under the American flag, or who are looking for trouble, have resented the compulsory study of English, the language of the conqueror. They complain that they are being robbed of their cultural heritage and are being forcibly Americanized.

One innovation which came with the Stars and Stripes is better health conditions, which have reduced the death rate about 50 per cent since 1900—and contributed to overpopulation. Yet, even now the death rate is the worst in the Western Hemisphere. During recent years the deplorable situation has been tackled and improved by the special services of the P.R.R.A. The population is being more widely instructed in personal hygiene; numerous rural dispensaries have been established, and twenty-four urban clinics. Perhaps most important has been the expansion of the Puerto Rican School of Tropical Medicine, which co-operates with the general health program as well as conducts research in tropical diseases. Still, these improvements are far from meeting the needs.

The bad economic conditions, worsened by the depression, emphasized an unsatisfactory political situation which threatened to become dangerous. From the first, some factions have favored complete separation from the United States. After 1922, one of these, the Nationalist, became radically energetic in its efforts to secure independence. The Liberals, who also wanted separation, worked for it more quietly. Two other parties, the Republican and Socialist,

have preferred that the Island remain under the Stars and Stripes, but have agitated for statehood.

In 1935 the Nationalists, whose head was Pedro Albizu Campos, a lawyer educated at Harvard, resorted to the use of violence. A clash resulting in bloodshed took place between members of the party and the police, when the Nationalists tried to prevent the students of the University of Puerto Rico from holding a mass meeting. The next year Colonel Francis E. Riggs, chief of police for Puerto Rico, was murdered in cold blood by two young Nationalists. In 1937 there was a fight in the city of Ponce between a body of Nationalists and the police, because the latter canceled at almost the last minute a parade for which they had given permission to the Nationalists. The alleged reason for the reversal, which took place after the police had consulted with the governor, was fear of disorder; but the result of it was many dead and more wounded. This affair is known among the radicals as the "massacre of Ponce." In 1938 an attempt was made upon the life of Governor Winship, who was very unpopular with the Nationalists, and, like most executives sent to Puerto Rico, apparently was a weakling and a poor choice for the position. These are only the most outstanding instances of resort to violence and murder resulting from the political dissatisfaction in Puerto Rico.

In April, 1936, shortly after the assassination of Colonel Riggs, Pedro Albizu Campos and seven other members of the Nationalist party, among them the treasurer and his nineteen-year-old son, were indicted on the charge of conspiracy against the United States Government, and were tried in Puerto Rico. The first jury, composed of seven Puerto Ricans and five Americans, failed to agree. The second jury found the men guilty, and they were given terms of from six to ten years and sent to Atlanta Federal Prison. But this jury was made up of ten American residents of the Island and two Puerto Ricans who were in the employ of American businessmen there. Later, one of the Americans wrote President Roosevelt that he believed the prisoners had not had a fair chance, for the jury was prejudiced against them. It was also charged that the judge who handled the case likewise showed prejudice in various ways. Indeed, there is much evidence to support the view that the men failed of a just trial. But the Circuit Court of Appeals in Boston upheld the

verdict of the Puerto Rico court. Efforts to get the cases reviewed by the Supreme Court of the United States have been futile. Yet, in spite of these facts, some public-spirited American residents of the Island and many honorable, intelligent Puerto Ricans have declared it their belief that the prisoners were guilty of the charges for which they were sentenced. But a portion of the best element of the population also have complained that, since the arrest of the Nationalists, civil liberties have been curtailed in Puerto Rico, especially freedom of speech and the right to assemble. The American Civil Liberties Union, which investigated the Ponce affair, supports this view, and blames the "massacre" upon the governor and the Island police.

Events in Puerto Rico of recent years have had an unfortunate effect upon the Spanish American countries, partly because Nationalists—including the wife of Albizu Campos—have been traveling there to rouse sympathy and to secure aid. Many eminent people in these lands have joined groups organized to work for the freedom of the Island as well as of the political prisoners. They, like the Nationalists themselves, feel it their mission to crusade for the liberty and sovereignty of Puerto Rico, which, they point out, is the only part of Spain's former American colonies lacking these blessings. The Cuban committee is especially active, and includes people of such distinction as the two historians, Herminio Portell-Vilá and Fernando Ortiz. Dr. Ortiz is perhaps the leading scholar of Cuba. The Nationalists and their Spanish-American sympathizers view the resort to violence for political ends in Puerto Rico much as Americans now look upon the battles of Lexington and Bunker Hill. To them, Pedro Albizu Campos is the George Washington of Puerto Rico. So long as the Island—at least with its present political status—remains under the flag of the United States, they will regard President Roosevelt's "Good Neighbor" gestures as hollow sham and rank hypocrisy. To them, the cause of Puerto Rico is the concern of all Spanish Americans.

Prompt measures should be taken by the American government to remedy the political grievances of the Islanders, as well as their economic difficulties. These people are tired of governors "with very large salaries and very poor preparation for their duties."

All Puerto Ricans want more self-government; but there is disagreement among them as to what form this should take; and opin-

ion has been shifting. During the past six years the Nationalist party seems to have lost strength, as does also the general sentiment for independence. The change in feeling, according to some of the citizens, is due to the aid given by the federal government to improve economic conditions and—even more—to the disgust of a large majority of the population with the “rioting and assassinating provoked by the Nationalists,” as a Puerto Rican of high character put it recently. Of Albizu Campos she wrote: “I think that every intelligent citizen felt that, whether the trial was fair or not, it was a good thing for the Island to be rid of such a man with his influence. . . . The energetic stop put to all these unfortunate events by the Federal authorities was admired and respected by our people.” Such is the view of one who would be happy with Puerto Rico a state in the Union; and probably many others who offer the same solution for the Island’s problems take this attitude. What proportion the unionists are of the total population is not apparent.

The Liberals are said to be now lukewarm on the question of independence, though they still include it in their platform. But they lost the last election to the coalition of Republicans and Socialists, who wish Puerto Rico to remain under the Stars and Stripes and who make statehood their goal. Resolutions calling for admission of Puerto Rico to the Union have been repeatedly introduced into Congress. The late Santiago Iglesias, then commissioner from the Island, proposed such a measure as recently as June, 1939. But nothing has come from these efforts. The men and women on Capitol Hill apparently reflect the view held by many Americans—that the differences in language, history, and political tradition would make the Island a misfit in the Union, and that its isolation in the Atlantic would delay indefinitely the Americanization of its inhabitants as a whole. Those desiring complete independence fully realize that if Puerto Rico were placed in the same economic relations with the United States as most Latin-American states she would starve to death, because of tariff walls; for almost all of her trade is with this country. Therefore, the *independentistas* wish, and expect, preferential tariff rates with the United States, or complete free trade. They also look to Uncle Sam to protect their independence under the Monroe Doctrine.

The economic dependence of the Islanders explains their reaction

to the bill introduced by Senator Tydings of Maryland shortly after his visit to Puerto Rico in 1936. The measure provided that in November, 1937, they should be permitted to vote upon the question: Shall Puerto Rico be sovereign and independent? Very good, so far. But another clause added that if the vote was favorable the Island should be prepared for independence in four years, during which period tariff walls should gradually be raised against her and should reach the regular rates for foreign nations by the time independence was granted. Naturally, resentment against the bill was keen, for it was generally believed to be aimed at forcing rejection of independence by offering it at the price of economic suicide. Anti-American demonstrations followed, through actions of others as well as of Nationalists, and in some places the Stars and Stripes was angrily hauled down.

Tydings soon abated resentment, however, by introducing into the Senate a resolution calling for investigation of conditions in the Island by a commission before further action was taken. But such an investigation was hardly called for, in view of the well-known economic dependence of Puerto Rico upon the continent. There the situation remains.

Some Puerto Ricans—probably a small minority—who regard independence or statehood as undesirable or unattainable suggest dominion status under the American flag—like Canada or New Zealand in the British Empire—as something which Congress might more readily favor. With such an arrangement, the people would have complete self-government regarding domestic affairs, and would expect free trade with the continent; but Washington would manage all foreign relations. Financially, this would be better than statehood, for, as at present, with complete home rule, the Islanders would not have to pay federal income taxes and they would retain all revenues coming from customs duties and excise levies.

After nearly a half century under the American flag, Puerto Rico is certainly entitled to a more democratic rule than the present one. The existing system is not in accord with the spirit of the Declaration of Independence, of the Preamble to our Constitution, or its Bill of Rights. Furthermore, whether Albizu Campos and his associates are guilty or innocent, it ill becomes a free country like ours to hold people in prison on political grounds. The question as

to the future government of the Island should be decided by vote of the Puerto Ricans themselves, with safeguards for the economic needs. And that vote should not be delayed longer. The United States has a moral obligation to remove promptly all basis for the charge that she is ruling an alien people who desire to be sovereign and free.

PERIPATETIC COFFIN

ROBERT WALKER

ON THE STILL, moonless night of February 17, 1864, a queer blunt-nosed, boiler-shaped craft, submerged to her hatch coamings, slipped noiselessly across the bar in Charleston, South Carolina, Harbor. This was the Confederate torpedo boat *H. L. Hunley*, probably the only submarine in the world at the time, and about to attempt what had been tried only twice before in all history but never yet accomplished—the sinking of an enemy ship by underwater warfare.

Suddenly a huge hull loomed up directly across her bow. It was one of the many Union ships that had been so stubborn in the attempt to blockade Charleston Harbor since early in the war. Lieutenant Dixon, commander of the *Hunley*, sighted the foe from his post at the open hatch. He ducked below and whispered tersely, "Full speed ahead." Inside, eight Confederate soldiers gripped their crank handles tighter. Already they had driven the heavy, iron-hulled craft four miles by sheer force. The air was foul with sweat, and breathing difficult. So closely were they packed that one could not move without all shifting. But ignoring blistered, bleeding palms, they bent their backs to whirl the hand-powered propeller for the final thrust against the enemy.

At 8:45 o'clock by the ship's bells an officer of the deck aboard the unsuspecting Union vessel first sighted to the starboard what appeared to be a floating barrel. He hailed it but got no answer. He leaned over the rail. Yes, it was moving—headed for his ship and coming rapidly. He shouted an alarm, ordered cables to be slipped and engines backed. A roll of drums sounded. Seamen tumbled out of bunks and ran for their posts. Too late. The *Hunley* struck just forward of the mainmast on a line with the magazine. A sheet of flame leaped from the waterline to light the topmost spars. Then the blast. One half of the men were blown up into the rigging, the other half out into the cold waters of the Atlantic. Staggering under the blow that tore a gaping hole in her side, the *Housatonic* sank quickly, stern foremost, heeling to port as she went down.

Although the *Hunley* had previously been dubbed *Peripatetic Coffin* because of her persistent habit of taking the lives of her crews, the title added even more to the mystery that shrouded, and still shrouds, her subsequent disappearance.

The submarine as a peculiar type of marine craft appears to have been introduced first by Cornelius Van Drebel, a Dutchman in the service of King James I of England. In 1620 he built a vessel in which, according to tradition, James himself was wont to cruise in the Thames at depths of twelve to fifteen feet. Attempts at underwater navigation during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, however, met with degrees of success that varied from poor to disastrous. Chief of these came in 1776 when David Bushnell, a Connecticut Yankee, launched his *American Turtle* against the British man-of-war *Eagle* anchored off New York City. Failure in this and several later attempts resulted from his inability to attach a charge of powder to the tough undersides of enemy vessels. Next important step in submarine evolution was the construction of the Civil War torpedo boat *H. L. Hunley*.

By 1863 the war had gone into its third year, and the Southern Confederacy was laboring under terrific disadvantages. Federal ships sailed into Southern waters and anchored with guns trained on harbor mouths. Loaded vessels were forced to idle at wharves, while storehouses nearby were piled high with cotton and tobacco—produce that claimed a ready market in England and France where it could be exchanged for military equipment so sorely needed by Jefferson Davis's struggling government. To attempt to run the blockade, however, was suicide for a merchantman that carried few, if any, guns. And the Confederacy had practically no armed frigates for escort, both ships and sailors having gone with the North when the split came. Nevertheless, Southern ports must be freed from the stranglehold of the Northern blockade, reasoned Confederate military leaders, or the South's cause would be lost. But as quickly as new armed vessels were launched they were captured or destroyed by the better outfitted Northern men-of-war. A few fast cutters were designed to slip through the blockade with exports and return with necessary supplies, but they were small and often were taken by the enemy; they were harmless as a flea in combat.

In desperation the South sought a way out. A Charleston in-

ventor got the idea of a submarine boat, and, encouraged by the government, went to work on it. Then one dark night early in the autumn of 1863 a group of officers aboard the U. S. S. *New Ironsides*, taking a last minute on deck before retiring, spotted a strangely shaped object moving toward the vessel. Officer of the Deck Howard ran to the rail. "Ahoy, there!" he hailed. The answer was a musket ball that stretched him on the deck, mortally wounded. But before the crew roused, an explosion rocked the *Ironsides*. In vain, Rear Admiral John A. Dahlgren pleaded with his gunners—the enemy was under the bow, so close that the ship's guns could not be depressed enough to rake her. Meanwhile, however, volley after volley of small arms was poured into the craft until it finally drifted out into the darkness.

The mystery was partly solved later when a Federal coal schooner picked up an exhausted swimmer who identified himself as Lieutenant Glassel, officer in command of the Confederate submarine *David*. Although he refused further information, papers found on Glassel described his vessel as cigar-shaped, fifty feet long and six in diameter, and so weighted with a steam engine as to be almost totally submerged. Glassel's orders had been to sidle up to the *Ironsides* under cover of darkness and there plant a sixty-pound charge of powder which was to be ignited by a time fuse. In the excitement of being discovered, however, the fuse had been cut too short and the submarine was unable to get far enough away before the explosion. Concussion of the blast had all but swamped the craft, fire in the boiler was extinguished, and the crew had taken to the water to escape the barrage of small arms. After further questioning, however, Glassel admitted that he had seen his engineer, J. H. Tomb, swim back to the *David*, had heard her engine start and seen her headed for shore. The attack had been frustrated, but there was seed for another attempt.

Although the episode was laughed off by most Union officers as just another hair-brained Confederate trick, it was an indifference they were later to regret. Dahlgren alone was concerned. Reporting the incident to his superiors, he wrote, "My ship has been attacked by a new type of Confederate vessel. . . . How far the enemy may seem encouraged I do not know, but I think it will be well to prepare against a considerable issue of these small craft."

During the days that followed, the Union fleet in Charleston Harbor as elsewhere held full sway and the blockade continued. Meanwhile, rumor from several sources had it that the Confederates were building more underwater boats and in "David vs. Goliath" fashion, as Dahlgren put it, were to launch against their antagonists. But official ears were deaf to the hearsay—all save Rear Admiral Dahlgren's. With memory of his past experience with this type of Confederate warfare still fresh in mind his apprehension increased. Finally, unable to keep silent longer, he again urged officials at Washington to take precautions: "Among the many inventions with which I have been familiar, I have seen none which have acted so perfectly at first trial. The secrecy, rapidity of movement, control of direction and precise explosion indicate, I think, the introduction of the torpedo element as a means of certain warfare. It can be ignored no longer; if 60 pounds of powder, why not 600?" Rumor soon became founded, and the Admiral of the South Atlantic Blockading Squadron wrote once more: "It is now known that the 'David' has got back to Charleston, and the attempt will be renewed on the Ironsides with larger charges of powder. Some plan of defense should be resorted to at once." Anxious months passed. Finally, Dahlgren, who apparently despaired of gaining aid, wrote January 7, 1864, contenting himself with facts alone:

I have reliable information that the Rebels have two torpedo boats ready for service, which may be expected on the first night when the water is suitable for their movement. One of these is the *David*, which attacked the Ironsides in October; the other is similar to it. There is also another one of another kind which is nearly submerged and can be entirely so. It is intended to go under the bottoms of vessels and there operate. . . . This is believed by my informant to be sure of well working though through previous bad management it has hitherto met with accidents.

The latter was apparently the *Hunley*. But like all others this warning too went unheeded, and the day when the North was to pay for her lack of concern drew nearer.

The South had not been marking time since the *David-Ironsides* incident. Commercial interests saw in the submarine a weapon of great possibility—one which might open ports to the traffic so valuable to them and to their government. A communication to B. A. Whitney, in charge of submarine torpedo boats at Charleston, was

posted: "I am authorized to say that John Fraser & Co. will pay over to any parties who shall destroy the United States steam iron-clad Ironsides the sum of \$100,000; a similar sum for the destruction of the wooden frigate Wabash, and the sum of \$50,000 for every monitor sunk. . . . I have reason to believe other men of wealth will unite and give with equal munificence toward the same end." Then, late in the year the submarine alluded to by Dahlgren "which is nearly submerged and can be entirely so" was constructed at Mobile as a private enterprise by the firm of Hunley and McKlintock, named for the senior partner and brought to Charleston on two flatcars.

Although not as large as her wooden-hulled predecessor, the new craft—the *H. L. Hunley*—was built of solid iron from the largest boiler available: "20 feet long and at the middle $3\frac{1}{2}$ feet wide by 5 feet deep." Limited interior space was restricted still further by compartments for water ballast. These were filled and emptied by valves which regulated emergency submerging and rising. A screw propeller attached to a shaft running the full length of the boat provided the *Hunley's* locomotion. It was revolved by cranks turned by the crew. The *Hunley* had no conning tower, but two "man-holes," one forward and the other aft. The commanding officer's position was at the bow, where he peered out the forward hatchway to steer. He controlled the rudder and two iron fins which were depressed or elevated to send the craft down, and once down, up. Either with these or the ballast tanks submersion could be accomplished quickly. As Engineer Tomb later remarked, "She could dive at a moment's notice, and often without it." Once submerged, the *Hunley's* crew could get a fresh supply of air only by rising to the surface and removing a hatch cover. In case of emergency her sole safety device was a weight made up of heavy pieces of iron bolted to the keel so that they might be detached from the inside, theoretically allowing the craft to rise to the surface. When submerged, the *Hunley* could be steered only by dead reckoning. Thus, night was considered to be the best time for attack. The submarine was to proceed on the surface under cover of darkness. When she came within striking distance she was to take sight, submerge, and make for the enemy.

The commanding officer was in charge of the *Hunley's* arma-

ment. Originally this was a torpedo. With it in tow the *Hunley* was to have raised havoc with the enemy ship by "swimming under it so the torpedo would explode on striking the opponent's keel." In actual practice, however, the torpedo was replaced by a copper cylinder holding ninety pounds of gunpowder attached to the end of a twenty-two-foot pole projecting from the bow. A trigger touched off the powder keg.

Hope ran high in Southern military circles as the *Hunley* was prepared for her first trial cruise. Although news of the craft had been kept secret for fear information would leak north, a crowd was on hand when the submarine cast off. For by now every Southerner, man and woman, was thoroughly involved in the conflict, and his interest quickened as each military venture came to mean one less crust of bread or another day without such practical luxuries as tea and coffee. No champagne had christened the *Hunley* at her launching, and no cheer was heard now as she moved out into the bay. This was grim business. Life or death of the Southern Confederacy might rest with this little ship. But even before the spectators had opportunity to revel in the possibilities of the new craft, tragedy came. A small steamer escorting the submarine suddenly decided to pull ahead and lead the way to the testing ground. In a moment its wash poured into the open hatchway of the *Hunley*. Only Lieutenant Payne, officer in command, and one of the crew were able to extricate themselves before the craft went down. Six of the crew drowned. The boat was raised and tied up at the dock. A second crew quickly volunteered. Just as the sixth man climbed through the hatch the *Hunley* lurched and sank. Someone had carelessly left a ballast-tank valve partially open. Result: six more lives lost. The *Hunley* was hoisted again. With valves secured, Payne took her out with a new crew. This time a sudden squall swamped her before the hatches could be closed. Again Payne escaped with two of his men, while five others went to the bottom with the boat.

On the fourth trial Colonel Charles Hasker took the place of one of the crew. Maneuvers were to be tried off Fort Sumter. While in tow of the gunboat *Etiwan*, the *Hunley* began to shear. Payne caught the towline to free it from the hatch coamings, tripped in a bight of the line and knocked a prop from under the horizontal diving plane. The *Hunley* promptly dove, gurgled to the bottom

once more with hatches wide open. Payne bobbed to the surface as usual. The Colonel got partly out before inrushing water clamped the hatch cover on his leg, and he went down in forty-two feet of water. Waiting until the vessel filled with water so that pressure on the hatch cover was relieved, he and two others reached the surface safely. The remaining five of the crew drowned. Another crew of eight volunteered, and Payne audaciously closed the hatches and filled the tanks for an attempt at underwater navigation. But the *Hunley* dove too abruptly and rammed her nose deep into the muddy bottom. There she stayed until the last man, this time even Payne, suffocated.

When General Beauregard, whose chief business was the defense of Charleston Harbor, saw the victims he shuddered and ordered the *Hunley* hauled ashore. "The bodies," he wrote, "were contorted into all kinds of horrible attitudes, some clutching candles, evidently endeavoring to force open the manholes; others lying in the bottom tightly grappled together, and the blackened faces of all presented the expression of their despair and agony."

Apparently, however, General Beauregard was forced to retract his order. For soon pressure of the Federal blockade became so unbearable that again the *Hunley* was launched. But this time Captain Hunley himself, having heard of the disasters, hastened to aid. Put in command, he confidently executed a dive under an anchored vessel, became entangled in a cable, and perished with his crew of five. By this time the submarine had been nicknamed *Peripatetic Coffin*—and no wonder; her victims numbered nearly forty.

But volunteers were still not wanting. In desperation a crew of men picked in Mobile from those who had helped build the craft were rushed to the scene. That they would be better able to operate it was the hope. Preparations were made for the seventh trip. Southern ports must be opened. But there had been practice enough, declared General Beauregard. The time was ripe for a surprise attack on the foe. Over the protests of many who had seen the *Hunley* in action, it was decided to use the vessel as a surface torpedo. Lieutenant George E. Dixon of Mobile, now in command, was instructed to submerge to the hatch coamings and with hatches open run at the enemy. His weapon was the powder keg fastened to

the pole projecting from the bow. And with it he rammed the *Housatonic* on the night of February 17.

News of the Confederate victory spread quickly. The North was amazed and perturbed. The Navy Department not only raised its eyebrows, but blinked incredibly, "The *Housatonic*, a 13-gun corvette of 1264 tons, sunk by a Rebel midget. . . . A disgrace!" Rear Admiral Dahlgren was first to act. Immediately he wrote to headquarters, this time in a more belligerent tone:

The Department will readily perceive the consequences likely to result from this event: the whole line of blockade will be infested with these cheap convenient and formidable defenses, and we must guard every point. . . . I would therefore request that a number of torpedo boats be made and sent here with dispatch. . . . I desire to suggest to the Department the policy of offering a large reward of prize money for the capture or destruction of a *David*; I should say not less than \$20,000 or \$30,000. They are worth more than that to us.

Meanwhile, the South rejoiced. Following a jubilant report of the sinking, the *Charleston Daily Courier* enthusiastically added: "This glorious success of our little torpedo boat, under the command of Lieutenant Dixon of Mobile, has raised the hope of our people, and the most sanguine expectations are now entertained for our being able to raise the siege in a way little dreamed of." But such Southern hope and any fear the North might have had, were short-lived. For the *Hunley* disappeared after the attack. A few believed she had backed away and escaped, but many more who thought they knew the *Hunley* better were convinced otherwise.

Finally, several months later, an official theory to account for the disappearance of the submarine was advanced by M. M. Gray, captain in charge of torpedoes at Charleston. He wrote: "Since no information has been received of either the torpedo boat or the crew I am of the opinion that the torpedo being placed at the bow of the boat, she went into the hole made in the *Housatonic* by the explosion of the torpedo and did not have sufficient power to back out; consequently sank with her." This opinion was accepted as fact and has gone into history books as the authentic explanation of the end of the *Hunley*.

In a detailed study of the subject, however, the author has come to the conclusion that while this may be a possible explanation, it is

not the most probable one. In fact, evidence indicates that the *Hunley* not only survived the skirmish but actually was returning to port with a first victory to her credit when disaster came. Two points establish this assumption: (1) the *Hunley* did not go down with the *Housatonic* and (2) the *Hunley* signaled her return to port *after the attack*. First, immediately at the close of the war a United States Navy Department diver went down to examine the wrecks of the two boats, the *Housatonic* and the *Hunley*. He located the *Housatonic* easily enough, but after dragging five hundred yards around the hull could find no trace of the submarine. The fact that the *Hunley* has never been located is further substantiated by Major Reading Wilkinson, District Engineer, now stationed at the United States Engineer's Office in Charleston. He refers to a report to the Chief Engineer of United States Army, dated 1872, which states that a contract was let for the removal of the two boats, but only the *Housatonic* was located. Captain D. W. Knox, officer in charge of Naval Records and Library of the Naval Department at Washington, also asserts that the *Hunley* has never been found, and adds that apparently she still lies where she sank. Secondly, since the *Hunley* did not go down with the *Housatonic* her obvious line of action would have been to recover from the attack as quickly as possible and set her course for the nearest haven, the wharf at Charleston. That this actually happened is indicated in a letter written by Lieutenant Colonel O. M. Dantzler to General Beauregard. Dantzler was the last person to see the *Hunley* on the night of February 17, for it was at Battery Marshall at the eastern end of Sullivan's Island that the *Hunley* made her last contact with Confederate forces. There it was arranged that after attacking the enemy, the commander of the submarine would signal the battery to show a light by which he could guide his craft on the return. Events of this night are subject of the letter written two days later, February 19, by Dantzler: "I have the honor to report that the torpedo boat at this point went out on the night of the 17th. . . . The signals agreed upon to be given in case the boat wished a light exposed at this post as a guide for its return were *observed and answered*."

Thus, in the light of these facts, it is now apparent that the *Hunley*, after six disastrous trials, finally made a successful attack on

an enemy ship with her torpedo, backed away to see her victim go down, then signaled for a light, and pointed her bow for port. How far she proceeded before a capricious wave splashed down her hatches or one of her treacherous gadgets went afoul is hard to say. But it is altogether likely that she went down on some shallow bar just off the shores of Sullivan's Island, perhaps somewhere between Fort Moultrie and Breach Inlet. And there today in the full glory of a quasi-victory that credits her with being the first submarine ever to sink an enemy ship and the last until the World War lies the ill-fated, boiler-hulled *Peripatetic Coffin* on the seventy-sixth anniversary of her disappearance. Probably with her hatches open and her crew securely bottled in. Unknell'd, uncoffin'd, and unknown.

TO JOHN LANDSEER, ESQUIRE: A NOTE
FROM CHARLES DICKENS

JOHN PAUL LUCAS, JR.

THOUGH the letters of Dickens, especially the correspondence with his biographer, John Forster, are full of references to his books, there is perhaps nowhere a clearer statement of the novelist's purpose than that in his letter of November 5, 1841, to his admired old friend John Landseer, Esquire—a letter hitherto unpublished. The letter to John Landseer was left, among voluminous records and correspondence, to the heirs of Sir Edwin Landseer, and is now in the possession of Mrs. Peter Call, of Tryon, North Carolina.

As in *Barnaby Rudge* and *A Tale of Two Cities*, Dickens shows the way to our contemporary social psychologists in his comprehension of mob behavior—rivaling even the science and art of *The French Revolution*—so in the Landseer letter, commenting on *Barnaby Rudge*, he supplies in a page a lesson on technique worth half-a-dozen textbooks. And one that should henceforth be included in every such work. Like Conrad and all the others who have stated their case as an end and aim, Dickens does not always realize his ideal. But he does see it, and see it clearly. Here at least, he knows what he is about and, granting much that has been said as to his inability to go beyond caricature and his limitations in plot articulation, he vindicates himself gloriously in his own element. A child of the ebb and flow of life in the streets of London, the very vulgarity for which he has so often been criticized, gave him an authentic sense of polyglot society. Equally important perhaps, he was one of the first of the long line of the great who rounded out an apprenticeship in the service of a newspaper—and one of the best in sheer power of observation.

John Landseer, Engraver to the King, lecturer on the philosophy of art, archaeologist, and Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries, was an energetic gentleman of seventy-six when Dickens's novel centering around the Gordon Riots began running serially. Having been a boy of fifteen when in March, 1780, lawless mobs crystallized about a nucleus of religious zealots incited by the visionary Lord George

Gordon and created a reign of terror, he was naturally much interested in *Barnaby Rudge*. He queried Dickens on a minor point, incidental to the story but of some interest to historians—the fact that John Wilkes, himself a revolutionary agitator and reformer, should have served as active magistrate in suppression of the riots. Dickens had ignored Wilkes in the account in *Barnaby Rudge*.

Dickens's reply to Landseer follows:

I DEVONSHIRE TERRACE
YORK GATE, REGENTS PARK
Fifth November 1841

MY DEAR SIR:

Let me thank you, both for your call and your note—and let me add that it affords me real pleasure to communicate with you in any way.

You are quite right in considering it very remarkable and worthy of note that Wilkes should have been the active magistrate in the suppression of the Gordon riots. I determined however, after some consideration, not to notice it in *Barnaby* for this reason: It is almost indispensable [*sic*] in a work of fiction that the characters who bring the catastrophe about and plan important parts should belong to the machinery of the Tale; and the introduction towards the end of a story, where there is always a great deal to do, of new actors until then unheard of, is a thing to be avoided, if possible, in every case. Now, if I had talked about Wilkes, it would have been necessary for me to glance at his career and previous position (for in that lies the singularity you speak of); and if I had stopped to do that, I should have stopped the riots, which must go on to the end headlong, pell mell, or they lose their effect. I therefore resolved to defer that point, with some others of equal curiosity and interest until the appearance of another edition would afford me an opportunity of relating them in *notes*, where they would not stem the current of the Tale, or embarrass the action.

I need not tell you who are so well acquainted with "Art" in all its forms, that in the description of such scenes, a broad, bold, hurried effect must be produced, or the reader instead of being forced and driven along by imaginary crowds will find himself dawdling very uncomfortably through the town, and greatly wondering what may be the matter. In this kind of work the object is, not to tell everything, but to select the striking points, and beat them into the page with a sledge hammer. And herein lies the difficulty. No man in the crowd who was pressed and trodden here and there, saw Wilkes. No looker-on from a window at the struggle in the street, beheld an Individual, or anything but a great

mass of magistrates, rioters and soldiery, all mixed up together. Being always in one or other of these positions, my object has been to convey an idea of multitudes, violence and fury; and even to lose my own dramatic personae in the throng, or only see them dimly, through the fire and smoke.

Until I received your second note last evening, I did not observe the slip of the pen to which it alluded. Even if I had done so, I should have understood, of course, what you had intended to write.

Believe me

My Dear Sir

Faithfully yours

CHARLES DICKENS

J. Landseer Esquire

It is a pleasure to note how skillfully Dickens leads up to the riots. We see, so to speak, the very genesis and creation of the mob. Lord Gordon is drawn briefly and effectively:

This lord was sincere in his violence and in his wavering. A nature prone to false enthusiasm, and the vanity of being a leader, were the worse qualities apparent in his composition. All the rest was weakness—sheer weakness; and it is the unhappy lot of thoroughly weak men, that their very sympathies, affections, confidences—all the qualities which in better constituted minds are virtues—dwindle into foibles or turn into downright vices.

Surrendered by self-seekers and traitors, he unwittingly sows the bitter seeds of death and destruction, his "Great Protestant Association in defense of religion, life and liberty" becoming a mob instrument, with appalling consequences. Here is, indeed, the Lord George of history, but with a deal more life and color than the historians give us.

To surround anything, however monstrous or ridiculous, with an air of mystery, is to invest it with a secret charm and power of attraction which to the crowd is irresistible. False priests, false prophets, false doctors, false patriots . . . have always addressed themselves at an immense advantage to popular credulity. Curiosity is a master passion. To awaken it, to gratify it by slight degrees, and yet leave something always in suspense, is to establish the surest hold that can be had, in wrong, on the unthinking portion of mankind.

It was just this technique that led to mischief.

We are prepared not only to *see* the mob in action but also to *understand* it as a vast throng "composed for the most part of the very scum and refuse of London, whose growth was fostered by bad criminal laws, bad prison regulations, and the worst conceivable police." Before the illustration, a classic definition:

A mob is usually a creature of very mysterious existence, particularly in a large city. Where it comes from or whither it goes few men can tell. Assembling and dispersing with equal suddenness, it is as difficult to follow to its various sources as the sea itself; nor does the parallel stop here, for the ocean is not more fickle and uncertain, more terrible when roused, more unreasonable, or more cruel.

The attack on Newgate Prison obviously suggests the Carlyle description of the Fall of the Bastille, but not at all to the discredit of Dickens. The largest body, that designed for the attack, "comprehended all the rioters who had been conspicuous in any of their former proceedings; all those whom they recommended as daring hands and fit for the work; all those whose companions had been taken in the riots, and a great number of people who were relatives or friends of felons in the jail. This last class included not only the most desperate and utterly abandoned villains in London, but some who were comparatively innocent. There was more than one woman there, disguised in man's attire, and bent upon the rescue of a child or brother. There were the two sons of a man who lay under sentence of death and who was to be executed along with three others the next day but one. There was a great party of boys whose fellow pickpockets were in prison; and at the skirts of all, a score of miserable women, outcasts from the world, seeking to release some other fallen creature as miserable as themselves, or moved by a general sympathy perhaps—God knows—with all who were without hope and wretched."

Old swords and pistols, without ball or powder; sledgehammers, knives, axes, saws and weapons pillaged from the butchers' shops; a forest of iron bars and wooden clubs; long ladders for scaling the walls, each carried on the shoulders of a dozen men; lighted torches, tow smeared with pitch and tar and brimstone; staves roughly plucked from fence and paling, and even crutches taken from crippled beggars in the streets composed their arms. Hugh and Dennis with Simon Tappertit between them, led the way. Roaring and chafing like an angry sea, the crowd pressed after them.

The action flares discordantly, and yet with rhythmical insistence, reaching the peak of a crescendo as the flaming prison gate finally yields.

. . . The women who were looking on shrieked loudly, beat their hands together, stopped their ears; the men who were not near the walls and active in the siege, rather than do nothing, tore up the pavement of the street, and did so with a haste and fury they could not have surpassed if it had been the jail and they were near their object. Not one living creature in the throng was for an instant still. The whole great mass were mad.

A shout! Another! Another yet, though few knew why, or what it meant. But those around the gate had seen it slowly yield and drop from its topmost hinge. . . .

Taken in the context, these lines do indeed seem beaten into the page with a sledge hammer, and the reader is carried along on a current that leaves him breathless.

One of the interesting things, repeated almost as often as *Barnaby Rudge* is mentioned, was Edgar Allan Poe's prediction of the outcome long before it appeared. The novel began to run at the end of January, 1841, and in May, Poe outlined in detail the exact plot of the as yet unpublished story. Such an analysis would hardly have been possible had not the events of *Barnaby Rudge* been logically and coherently related.

Little or no apology of course can be made for the exaggerated and banal caricature of Chesterfield. In attempting a novel in the historical tradition, Dickens owes much to the influence of Scott, whom he admired greatly, but it is significant that in both of his books of this type, he stayed within a few years of his own time.

The relationship of Dickens to the Landseer family was a long and pleasant one. He was especially close to Sir Edwin Landseer, the most famous of the distinguished sons of John Landseer. An incident is related by the Landseer biographer, James Manson, which I do not recall having seen elsewhere. Dickens, though clean shaven during the earlier part of his life, began to sport first a mustache and then a full beard, much to the exasperation of Forster and other associates. It was shortly after he had assumed this disguise that Landseer called on him one day.

Presently Boz remarked to the eminent painter, "But you don't tell me how you like it."

"Like what?" Landseer questioned.

"All this," exclaimed Dickens, stroking his beard demonstratively.

"Oh, *that!*" rejoined his old friend, "I like it immensely—I shall see less of you than ever."

J. RAMSAY MACDONALD: APOSTLE OR APOSTATE

MARGUERITE HALL ALBJERG

WHEN THE jubilee commemorating Queen Victoria's sixty years as British sovereign was being celebrated, a gala parade honoring Her Majesty was one of the festive events of the Imperial Carnival. An English beggar, while watching the passing pageant, exclaimed: "I own Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and India but I am starving nevertheless, because I have no bread. I am a citizen of the greatest world power, and everybody should bow before me. But when I asked a negro for alms yesterday, he gave me a kick instead." Viewing this same patriotic exhibition, moved by its pomp and grandeur, while at the same time haunted by the pitiful plight of thousands of these hungry English beggars, a little-known Scotsman, just then on the eve of his public career, pondered and reflected on his duties as a Socialist subject to the Crown.

This thoughtful observer's origins were humble, his outlook idealistic, his creed socialistic, his education still in progress, and his political entree by way of the Independent Labor party. He was endowed with superior mentality, inordinate ambition, remarkable industry, firm convictions, and a genuine eagerness to serve humanity. In addition to these endowments, he possessed an excellent physique and a handsome presence; moreover, he had wooed and won a remarkable wife of rare discernment, who shared his ardor to improve society and who also brought economic independence to his simple household. Such was the equipment of James Ramsay MacDonald when he entered upon his public life.

Nearly forty years have elapsed since his political baptism. During those four decades he knew bitter obloquy and triumphant exaltation; he experienced the sudden shifting of his political following from Laborites to Tories, and at the close of his active public career he found himself in opposition to the very party he had led for a generation. Such a record, when made by a man of parts and of apparent integrity, caused many contemporaries to call this Scotsman the most perplexing and inscrutable political figure of his generation.

In spite of the fact that MacDonald was almost impervious to the influence of others, nevertheless, four women, at critical periods in his lifetime, managed to alter his viewpoint. In his infancy, an imaginative and dynamic grandmother enhanced his love of the romantic by picturesque ballads and fanciful fairy tales with which she filled his ever eager and alert mind. In his youth, his hard-working but remarkable mother inculcated in the sensitive lad the importance of self-respect and a regard for the dignity of labor. In his manhood, his intelligent and idealistic wife helped to keep warm and glowing his enthusiasm for the Socialist cause and his desire to improve the lot of the common man. In his later years, a brilliant and clever marchioness revealed to him the compelling charm and gracious camaraderie of Tory society so that he felt strongly drawn to the aristocracy "which has the wealth to make life a thing of grace."

In an attempt to understand MacDonald's magnetic and many-sided personality, it should be remembered that, in the first place, he was a self-made Scot. Born in 1866 on the beautiful Bay of Largsmouth, he started life with no economic or social advantages. Poverty constantly dogged his steps and opportunity rarely saluted him.

His formal schooling was meager, but early he evinced his interest in scientific literature and in historical writings. In fact, his first serious ambition was to be a scientist, which was a matter of notable significance since his scientific studies early taught him respect for facts and a familiarity with the scientific method. When he was in his late teens, London lured him to its fascinating midst. There he experienced the proverbial difficulties of the impecunious but ambitious young man who seeks a livelihood and fame in a great metropolis. A poorly paid invoice clerk, long hours of night study, work in a chemistry laboratory, passing the South Kensington examination in science, a breakdown in health, secretary to a Liberal M.P., and occasional flings at journalistic writing—all these suggest his varied occupations and his heroic struggle for a foothold. However, his youthful deprivations and his forced dependence on his own resourcefulness quickened his sympathy for the underprivileged, developed his self-reliance and aloofness, and probably inspired in him an undue respect for upper-class gentility—a sentiment that seemed enhanced in his post-war years.

In the second place, Ramsay MacDonald was a Socialist of lifelong standing. Shortly after his arrival in London, the Fabian Society, which has been a remarkable forum for training many of England's liberal intellectuals, added him to its adherents. This was a significant association, for it introduced him to some of the ablest thinkers of his day, many of whom were men and women of culture as well as believers in social reform. It also served as an excellent preparatory school in which he received valuable training in platform speaking and debate and where his plastic opinions were tested and molded by conflict with the ideas of many brilliant associates.

Although his first party affiliation was with the Liberals, he notified Keir Hardie, in 1894, that he would join the Independent Labor party (called the I.L.P.), which had been founded the year before. In 1900 the I.L.P., together with the Social Democratic Federation, the Fabian Society, and the Trades Unions formed the Labor Representation Committee whose ultimate purpose was to organize a Labor party. MacDonald was secretary of the Committee, and for twenty years he worked enthusiastically, intelligently, and strenuously before he attained his objective. When the Labor party eventually took form, its somewhat conflicting elements made it a heterogeneous group difficult to lead. In fact, a wag likened it to "one of the anomalous animals of mythology. Its brains are socialist, its body is trade-unionist, its tail is Bolshevik." Nevertheless, MacDonald argued that it was superior to any of the other parties for it had a greater knowledge and understanding of mankind because "Man and his struggles have been the labor party's university."

There were some contemporaries who felt that MacDonald's socialism was never a deep-rooted conviction but merely a protest program inspired by the unfortunate surroundings in which he had started life. But that was too shallow an explanation of the political and economic philosophy of a man who labored arduously for nearly a generation for his beliefs, the virility of which was not diminished by a marriage which brought him economic independence. Nor does a very ambitious man deliberately choose apparent political oblivion and endure bitter persecution with magnificent fortitude merely because he was disgruntled with a social order that permitted him to begin life unpropitiously.

Ramsay MacDonald has been designated frequently as "an in-

tellectual with revolutionary sympathies," and in such a characterization there was much truth. But these revolutionary sentiments never prompted him to espouse revolution by force, a doctrine he opposed vigorously throughout his lifetime. Though he yearned to reconstruct British society along more equitable lines, his knowledge of history was too profound to let him sponsor a radical break with the past.

He called socialism "an application of mutual aid to politics and economics." He believed socialistic changes should be effected only by evolutionary processes and only after the public had been educated to the need of and advantage in such a new order. He maintained socialism's watchword was evolution, not revolution; its proper battlefield was Parliament. He shared Jaurés' sentiment that "No trick, no machinery of surprise, can free Socialism from the necessity of winning over the majority of the nation by propaganda and legal methods." He also insisted that Socialists "have an enormous respect for the human mind as contrasted with the human fist."

There were many Socialists who maintained that MacDonald was not of their ilk since he rejected as inadequate, obsolete, or inconsistent some of the Marxian tenets, such as the economic interpretation of history, the inevitability of the class struggle, and the dictatorship of the proletariat. He contended that the reason for confusing communism and anarchism with socialism was because "Every kind of opposition to the existing order is grouped together and made identical in minds not accustomed to discriminate in an intelligent way." He condemned both anarchism and communism as satisfactory states for organized society. When the I.L.P. threatened to go communistic, he fought with perseverance and skill such a conversion with the result that by Easter, 1920, the I.L.P. definitely rejected communism.

MacDonald pointed out that the most compelling problem confronting an industrial democracy was "How to make society conform in its functions to the moral standards of the individual." In the beautiful memorial to his wife, he portrayed socialism in these poetic terms: "It is a spirit and a tendency. It suffuses all things in this age. Its morality is the command of the heart uttered in persuasive firmness that the injustice done to one is the reproach heaped upon

all; its economics is the imperative to which commercialism itself must respond; its politics is the path mapped out by destiny for a state which uses communal consciousness as a protector of individual life and liberty."

MacDonald's long-time view of socialism's accomplishments irritated many Laborites who accepted eventually the slogan of the I.L.P.—"Socialism in Our Time"—a viewpoint with which he was not in sympathy. Furthermore, his contemptuous disapproval of the high-sounding resolutions and the noisy pyrotechnics of Labor conventions annoyed his followers. He never thought that "To expand your lungs and lose your head" was evidence of a sincere passion. "Verbal heroics," which were so frequent on such occasions, were anathema to him. Then, too, fundamentally he was a "middle-of-the-roader," and, as Harold J. Laski pointed out, "Like all men who choose the middle of the road, there is a certain hesitation in his step." This was a quality that vexed some of the cocksure mediocrities whose political viewpoint was determined by uncritical partisanship.

But MacDonald was something more than a self-taught Scot and a moderate Socialist—he was, in the third place, a credulous idealist. His idealism was closely connected with his socialism, for the latter was to him a religion which often inspired him to lofty sentiments and to high-minded conduct. An idealist first conceives an enlightened program and then if he is a credulous idealist, he tries to achieve his goal even though the striving be difficult and the price exacted be costly. MacDonald in his youth and prime belonged to this select breed.

Among the many illustrations of his believing idealism, the most illustrious was that of his stand on the war in 1914. For years he had opposed the settling of international differences by military methods. When the crisis of August, 1914, came, he reasserted his position and maintained it in the face of personal political disaster, violent vituperation, and intense pressure such as only a nation in the grip of wartime hysteria can apply. Mary Agnes Hamilton asserts a principle that was of the very essence of MacDonald's belief, namely, "If wrong is ever to be resisted effectively it must be resisted when resistance seems ineffective. Only so can moral opinion

ever be built, and the building of moral opinion is the justification of politics and politicians."

The government offered him a cabinet seat, a most enticing bribe to an aspiring Labor leader, if he would only support the war. But conscience triumphed over ambition; so he remained merely an M.P. He resigned his party leadership but maintained his Parliamentary seat until his defeat in the Khaki election of 1918. Although opposed to the war, he was eager to alleviate the suffering it entailed; so he joined an Ambulance Corps in Belgium. His service there was terminated by venomous maligning at home. In these days, MacDonald clearly considered his political career ended, but his public responsibilities he could not so regard. He explained that he and his party were accused of being "pro-German" and "agents of the Kaiser," whereas they were "simply democratic and international." To them victory meant "a freeing of democracy, not the destruction of any people, and certainly not the partitioning of Europe for purposes of revenge, imperialism and militarism."

To review the calumnies heaped on this courageous man in those tempestuous days is to recognize that there are still idealists who suffer for their faith. Most of his friends repudiated him; some of the newspapers reviled him, while others treated him with disdainful silence; the Lossiemouth Golf Club expelled him; the sailors' union refused to man a vessel on which he was embarking; even the government so distrusted him that it sent a beautiful woman spy who pretended to be a sympathizing pacifist who wanted to communicate with German friends. But this hardy Scot came through this ordeal of defamation unbowed, and what was more remarkable, he survived the castigation without bitterness. It seems quite possible, however, that the recollection of the ignominy and silent anguish of this period influenced him more than a decade later when confronted with another soul-searching decision.

One of MacDonald's fellow-countrymen admitted that during the war "His studied moderation was a lesson in good manners to all who derided him." This Northern Celt may not have been born a "gentleman," but his conduct unquestionably earned him the right to be called one. Furthermore, in waging his fight he always did so according to the accepted code of well-born Englishmen; in fact, his observance of the rules was often more scrupulous than was that of

many who were to the manor born. Even so, his social boycott was enforced by many London hostesses; as a result, he pursued a very lonely life. Infrequently, however, he received and accepted an invitation, and on one such occasion he was seated at dinner next to a well-intentioned, but loquacious, lady who sympathized profusely with her handsome, well-mannered dinner partner for having to bear the same name as that of the unspeakable M.P. and pacifist, MacDonald.

Fourth, this shrewd and gifted Scot was a politician. By that designation, one should not deduce that he was a corrupt intriguer or a crafty manipulator, but rather that he was a man who loved the political game, who had mastered its rules, who used this knowledge to attain certain ends. His personal equipment was propitious for such a career: an imposing and handsome bearing, an exceptionally melodious and resonant voice, an innate aptitude for debate, a facile and skillful pen, a remarkable capacity for sustained mental effort. Then, too, he had that happy characteristic which is possessed by only a few platform men, of being able to sway large numbers by his oratory. Furthermore, he had the art of establishing a flattering intimacy with his audience, a situation very gratifying to most listeners. A French journalist insisted that to Frenchmen, MacDonald's "eloquence would seem both monotonous and ministerial," but not so to Englishmen. As a matter of fact, in Parliamentary debate, this adroit Scotsman was a political competitor that many contemporaries hesitated to embroil in controversy, for he possessed an equanimity that his opponent could not disturb; he was adept in the friendly flattery of his antagonist; he was gifted in detecting the vulnerable spots of his adversary; he was skillful in the infliction of merciless blows.

An Oxford man, Joseph Clayton, observed in 1924 in *Current History* that MacDonald "trained himself to become a statesman as men and women train themselves to become painters and musicians." Furthermore, with shrewd sagacity this Oxonian noted that the Scotsman early discerned that "what the English require of a parliamentary leader are high ideals on the platform, good debating speeches in the House of Commons, a clean personal record, a readiness to speak well of a fallen foe or beaten enemy, a conscience in decent working order and some likeness to the average man." Mac-

Donald not only recognized the necessity for such qualifications but also acquired them.

His friends spoke of his "genius for organization"; his enemies called it "a passion for intrigue"; less hostile critics designated it "a zest for wire-pulling." What was indisputable was that he possessed a talent for handling men. There were some of his followers who complained of his secrecy and aloofness, his absence of spontaneity in personal relations, his lack of appreciation for their labor in his behalf, his insistence on obedience instead of co-operation. Nevertheless, for a decade after the war, the masses in increasing numbers marched behind his banner, while proselytes from the upper classes were frequently attracted to his party.

Fifth, Ramsay MacDonald was a family man whose home drew heavily on his affection and devotion, and yet it yielded to him the greatest joy and keenest inspiration that he ever knew. In matrimony, he was indeed fortunate, for his marriage was not only his "first introduction to happiness," but it provided him with a companion who was intellectually and emotionally equipped to share his aspirations and aid his career.

Margaret Ethel Gladstone was the niece of the scientist Lord Kelvin and a lady of gentle birth. She not only brought to her husband a social background and pecuniary aid that were helpful, but she also brought to him the far greater boon of a spirit spontaneous, adventurous and sprightly, and a sympathy that was ready and unfailingly understanding. She proved a delightful and intelligent mother to their six children, while at the same time she remained always her husband's well-informed "associate in politics," the Labor party's first social hostess, and an untiring champion of the oppressed women of the working classes. One wit remarked that she "unlike many wives, was not a millstone but a milestone in his [her husband's] pilgrimage for gentility."

Reared in a sheltered and cultivated environment where orthodoxy was the mode, Margaret Ethel Gladstone first "visited 'the poor' as a superior person anxious to be helpful and to do her Christian duty." She was influenced by Charles Kingsley and Frederick Maurice to take up socialism because of the plight of millions of the unprivileged people about her. The Gentleman with a Duster related of her that "She had pained and offended her family by cham-

pioning Gladstone in his crusade for Irish self-government; she was now to shock them dreadfully by seeing virtue in the little group of Socialists seeking to alter the economic conditions of human life."

It was said of MacDonald that he loved the battle because he was a born fighter, while his wife "gave to it a spirit of consecration." But she also introduced another attribute the Socialists sorely needed and that was a certain quality of gladness, a sense of genial kindness. The mellow beneficence of her spirit and the quick-sighted perceptions of her mind made her a personality whose counsel was sought by those in search of intellectual communion as well as by those in distress.

Her husband said of her that by 1895 she had groped her way from "the human pity, which was her inheritance, to the reforming faith which was her conquest." He wrote a memorial of her which is so exquisite a tribute that it would give to her memory an immortality if her years of unselfish service had not already done so. She died in 1911, after sixteen years of beautiful companionship during which she seemed to bring ineffable blessing to her family and a rare enrichment of spirit to a very wide circle of friends. On the eve of her departure, she revealed her inner self when she admonished her husband: "Oh, put romance into the lives of the children! Teach them to know the things of the spirit." To have walked by the side of such as she was to give to her companion an intensified idealism, an invigorated faith in socialism, a softened and gentler kindness.

Sixth, there was something of the incurable romantic in Ramsay MacDonald. Some called this trait merely undue sentimentality, but that was scarcely an adequate characterization. Already it has been noted how his fanciful grandmother stirred his youthful imagination with heroic ballads and adventurous tales. This early acquaintance seemed to ripen into a genuine bent for the romantic. His imaginative and fancy-loving wife also fostered this tendency; in fact, it was often encouraged in their conversations, their reading, and their world travels. Moreover, it was evidenced in his love of pageantry, in his fondness for symbolism and form, especially if they had their origin in ancient tradition. It also was apparent in his liking for the old Scotch folklore and for the medieval romances; the fact that Sir Walter Scott was his favorite author would indicate to some the same

characteristic. There are paragraphs in his memorial to his wife that show this same strain. His well-known preference for the etiquette and ceremonial of the Court was but another indication of his love of festal display. An active imagination abetted this personal characteristic which no doubt gave color to his life and enhanced the vividness of his oratory and his journalism. To many Laborites, this peculiarity was incomprehensible and also a bit reprehensible, yet it was of the very essence of the man.

In the seventh place, this self-tutored Scot had many of the earmarks of an intellectual aristocrat. His manners and his natural tastes were those of a cultivated gentleman. Although born a member of the working class, he never labored with his hands and there was nothing of the successful tradesman and prosperous artisan in his bearing or behavior. While he did not choose his acquaintances because of the title they bore or the bank balance they carried, yet he did find his most congenial spirits among the intelligentsia who were nimble with their facile minds, who were courteous even though formal, who were interested in travel and the arts, who could converse with zest on things other than "shop." Indisputably, he liked to dine with the Tories but usually he wanted to vote with the Laborites. This inclination aided his undoing, for it was a viewpoint that his colleagues and followers could not understand and were slow to forgive. It was characteristic of this intellectual aristocrat that he liked "To do strong things in a quiet way, new things in an old way, revolutionary things in a constitutional way."

Finally, this Northern Celt was the holder of an important political office. As leader of the opposition and as four times prime minister, he experienced the flattering intoxication of political power and prestige and he knew the fatiguing exhaustion that comes to those who carry for long the responsibilities of public office. Both took their toll of him and death found him divested of power and party. Oswald Garrison Villard, a great admirer of the Scot, noted that "The dreadful acid of office-holding steadily corroded his nature."

During both his Labor premierships, in 1924 and in 1929-1931, he was dependent on Liberal support for his working majority, which fact limited greatly the range of his legislative program. Not unnaturally, he was eager to convince England that his party, which

often was maligned unjustly, nevertheless was worthy of the trust imposed in it, so he was loathe to startle the country by suggesting drastic changes at the outset.

But in foreign affairs his record was meritorious. Probably better informed on the subject than any English foreign secretary in generations, he also brought to his task an optimistic idealism and a constructive plan for repairing the international damage of the World War. He believed in the League of Nations and wanted it used as an international depot for the foregathering of Great Britain and Europe, but he did not wish it to continue merely as "the executive council for the conquerors." He was eager to help Germany regain her confidence and to adjust more equitably her reparations settlement. He was desirous of promoting friendly intercourse with Soviet Russia and of removing the chill from Anglo-American relations. Finally, he wanted not only to facilitate European good will but also to revive confidence in Great Britain's good faith. But his splendid record in foreign affairs mitigated but slightly the disappointment of Laborites, who had fantastic visions of the economic millennium that would ensue when Labor ran the government.

Two factors contributed significantly to the modification in MacDonald's character which occurred during the past decade. First, his carrying of official responsibility increased his conservative tendencies which were many and which were usually overlooked by contemporaries who were invariably struck by other more obvious traits. It was entirely erroneous to think of him as suddenly turning from radicalism to conservatism, for he was never as extreme as his Tory opponents contended, while his profound belief in evolutionary methods and gradual change always gave a conservative cast to his viewpoint. Nevertheless, it was unquestionable that this instinctive and lifelong inclination was accentuated by his premierships. Second, the nerve-racking months of heavy responsibility and of frightful fatigue undermined his physique. As a result, besides a chronic eye condition which became acute, he suffered from nervous difficulties which on more than one occasion virtually incapacitated him. The game of politics has no rule which gives quarter to a player who, though physically disqualified for the time being, still continues in the fight.

For one who was frequently ill and often harassed, it was easy

to gravitate toward those who did not annoy him with chatter about impending political problems and who could furnish him with such congenial intellectual and cultural companionship. Therefore, his association with Labor members grew steadily less, while his relations with the British upper classes became increasingly intimate. The journalist, S. K. Ratcliffe, pointed out that MacDonald, when Labor premier, never entertained a cabinet member at his week-end house parties and, furthermore, as England's first Socialist prime minister, he never proposed a single Socialist measure. Then, too, the aristocracy made it exceedingly easy for a Labor prime minister to find a restful and agreeable respite in their company. Sidney Webb shrewdly observed that the British classes no longer repress their opponents but when promising leaders of the common people come forth, "As soon as they show evidence of power they are seduced."

When the crisis of 1931 came, the Labor cabinet had to choose between their party's insistence that there be no reduction in the dole and the opposition's demand for a balanced budget and a slash in all government expenses. The country thought it was facing another national emergency, and His Majesty reflected this tension when he asked MacDonald to form a coalition government to guide the nation in its seeming hour of peril. The Scotsman's decision to accede to King George's request was an epochal event, for it severed MacDonald's lifelong connection with the party he had led to power, though he still insisted he was a Labor man; it enhanced the Conservative party's prestige, for MacDonald became their political hostage, "held up in front of the Tory Party to keep its enemies from shooting at it." That Ramsay MacDonald was motivated by sincerity and an honest desire to serve his country, many people conceded; but that his decision left blemish on his years of progressive leadership, few denied. To have failed to stand with his party on a major issue would have been pardonable. To have joined that party's traditional foe and lead the battle against lifelong friends was unforgivable.

Although a canny Scot, MacDonald was not well versed in the fastidious technique of subtle social flattery. The early loss of his charming and companionable wife, whose social discernment would have been much more astute than was his, made him lonely, less guarded, and, therefore, more susceptible in such an encounter.

When the fourth important feminine influence of his life crossed his path in the person of the exceedingly clever and dazzling Marchioness of Londonderry, his defenses were falling. She and the Marquis were said to have "seduced" MacDonald, although the seduction was untainted with any hint of scandal. After the national government was organized, the Marchioness inaugurated the Londonderry-MacDonald entente which apparently ripened into an intimate friendship.

For this liaison the Prime Minister was caustically chided. An I. L. P. leader once asked him in the House of Commons if he had decided to "abandon the Red Flag in favor of the Londonderry Air?" In his autobiography, Viscount Snowden related with relish the following: "The day after the National Government was formed he [MacDonald] came into my room in Downing Street in very high spirits. I remarked that he would now find himself very popular in strange quarters. He replied, gleefully, rubbing his hands, 'Yes, tomorrow every Duchess in London will be wanting to kiss me.'"

Harold J. Laski, a brilliant member of the Labor party and a sharp critic of MacDonald, said of him: "He became effectively a member of London society, and its standard of values seemed increasingly his own. . . . He had grown away from the people who had made him eminent. He had lost the willingness to make their dreams the measure of his own. . . . Henceforth, he could live at ease in Zion; for in its habitations one does not listen anxiously for the birthcry of a new world. He has avoided denunciation; he has escaped the danger of a second exile for his faith. The ribbon is in his coat; and he will not live to read the verdict of history."

But historians will no doubt be more relenting than this eminent Laborite when they evaluate MacDonald's entire career. If they think him merely "the greatest English actor since Garrick," as some insist, still they must admit that his appreciative audience included huge numbers from every class in English society and in every civilized nation in the world. Or if they believe "the revolution which this man started outgrew him," as a few contend, still they must concede him a period of thirty years of devoted service of inestimable value to British socialism. Or if they dub him a traitor to his own ideals, they must also remember that for seven years

he endured a cruel martyrdom for what he believed. Or if they call him an apostate to labor in his aging days, still they must record him in his prime as one of the greatest apostles British labor ever knew.

After MacDonald's defeat in November, 1935, Stanley Baldwin arranged for him to contest a seat for the Scottish universities in a by-election, and he was returned to Parliament. But this did not signalize a return to power or political prestige or public confidence—it was merely Tory recognition of an outstanding political debt which must be promptly and gracefully paid. There was, however, a pathetic tribute and a sad rebuke to this Scot before his death in the utterance of one of his disillusioned followers, Eric Havelock, who exclaimed: "How can we hate a man who fought for us so long, and fought in solitude? How can we love a man who betrayed us in the full tide of his success? How can we forget a man whose days were not alien to heroism, until darkness gathered on his eyes and round his soul?"

ON THE POSSIBILITY OF PROGRESS IN PHILOSOPHY

MORTIMER TAUBE

ONE OF THE most frequent accusations made by those who belittle or attack the validity of philosophic speculation is that philosophy, unlike most special sciences, does not advance. In a special science, such as biology or physics, progress, in the sense which implies the utilization of earlier work and building upon it, is the rule. To be sure, even in a special science it is sometimes necessary to re-examine fundamentals; but, even in these cases, the reconstructions that ensue are genuine advances made possible by the very fundamentals that are seen to require modification. In contrast to this situation, it is said that in philosophy everyone starts from the beginning; that philosophy moves neither in an ascending spiral nor in a straight line, but in a circle. There are some who would even begrudge this attribution of order which the analogy of circular movement implies. They would liken philosophy to Leacock's rider who mounted his horse and galloped off madly in all directions.

There is a very important and definite sense in which philosophy does not progress as do the special sciences. Philosophy is concerned with the elucidation of certain general notions and with the description and understanding of pervasive characters of existence. It is not concerned with the accumulation of facts and items of knowledge except as such accumulation may help it to increase its understanding of the problems with which it is perennially occupied. Each return to the beginning in the light of the knowledge contributed by the special sciences may eventuate in a deeper and more fruitful understanding.

It is unimportant, however, for the immediate purposes of this essay whether or not this conception of philosophy is accepted. I shall be concerned in what follows with reasons for the lack of progress in philosophy which have nothing to do with the question of the nature of philosophy or the nature of science. These reasons may be succinctly expressed by the observation that, in general, philosophy has no tradition of scholarship. It may be objected that this

statement is unwarranted in light of the common reproach that philosophers concern themselves too much with the history of philosophy and too little with the truth or meaning of what philosophy asserts. I do not think this reproach was ever to the point and I am sure it is not to the point during this day. Consider, for example, the fact that, of all subjects studied in our universities and colleges, philosophy has the poorest bibliographical tools. I realize that steps are now being taken to remedy this situation, but the lack of adequate bibliographies is symptomatic and not etiological. Philosophers have not felt the need of bibliographies and indexes because most of them are unconcerned with the work of their fellows except as grist for their own mills, in a sense to be made clear below. From the day a student takes his first philosophy course, he is conditioned towards the belief that philosophers are to be refuted, not studied. His instructor at "Siwash" or even at Cambridge demonstrates how simple it is to demolish the work of Plato, Descartes, Leibnitz, Spinoza, and the rest. The student is encouraged in originality until someday, perhaps, he grows up to emulate one of the leading lights of the contemporary philosophic scene in England, a man who writes papers proving that most philosophy is nonsense and admits publicly that he has not bothered to read Plato.

I have suggested in other places that more knowledge of the history of philosophy might make most originality vacuous and most refutations pointless. It seems rather an inane business to attack philosophy because it does not advance while, at the same time, boasting of a lack of knowledge of previous writings in philosophy. I wonder how much any of the special sciences would advance if their practitioners adopted a similar attitude. I realize that the results of past scientific labors have been codified and that such results must be mastered by students not as history but as a code. The history of philosophy in general may not be susceptible to such codification because of the difference in principle mentioned above; but much work on detailed questions which play so large a part in philosophic discussion is susceptible to codification. The compilation of such a code was advocated by Professor Lovejoy in an article, "On Some Conditions of Progress in Philosophical Inquiry," which appeared in the *Philosophical Review* over twenty years ago. He suggested the preparation of a "comprehensive *catalogue raisonné* of

'considerations,' arranged according to the problems or the thesis to which they are, or have by any considerable body of thinkers been supposed to be, pertinent—a catalogue literally and very thoroughly *raisonné*, a modern *Summa Metaphysica* of an undogmatic and non-partisan kind."

Professor Lovejoy held that the preparation of such a catalogue was an indispensable condition of philosophic progress. He did not suggest that future generations of students must exhaust themselves in studying and mastering the catalogue in its entirety. He argued, merely, that, before rushing into print with an "original" idea on meaning, causation, perception, and the like, a philosopher should be required to know what has been said on these topics and what considerations have been thought to be relevant by other thinkers who have considered them. Were this requirement respected, the same battles would not be fought over and over again in our philosophic journals; relevant considerations would not be overlooked or dismissed in footnotes; and important questions would not be needlessly complicated by irrelevant considerations. This is not to say that inclusion in the catalogue guarantees the pertinency of all possible arguments or the lack of pertinency of arguments not included. Professor Lovejoy proposed, not the creation of a sacred doctrine, but the organization of knowledge. It would undoubtedly be part of the business of philosophers to refine, modify, enlarge, and even overthrow portions of the catalogue. But glib assertions made in ignorance or defiance of the catalogue could, in most cases, be dismissed as so much poppycock.

Professor Lovejoy's program occasioned much comment, mostly unsympathetic. He was accused of attempting to destroy the broad humanism that has always been one of the "glories" of philosophy; of attempting to confine arbitrarily the field of philosophic speculation; and of attempting to throttle the creative imaginations and originality of philosophers. His plan for the co-operative compilation of a *Summa Metaphysica* was not acted upon, and it bore fruits only in his own work and that of his more immediate colleagues. I believe that the rejection of his program was motivated, to a considerable degree, by the vanity of philosophers. Like most scholars, and nonscholars, philosophers are vain. But the vanity of philosophers has more disastrous consequences than the vanity of scholars in other

fields. In most fields, scholars are vain about their knowledge; in philosophy, scholars are vain about their critical ability. A philosopher might hesitate to admit that he could not offer an effective criticism or refutation of anything he read (unless the material happened to express views identical with his own); but he would not hesitate to admit not having read something which, on the basis of convincing evidence, has genuine importance. A professor of theoretical physics could not be ignorant of the work of Einstein and hold his position; but a work such as Whitehead's *Process and Reality*, which has as much significance in philosophy as Einstein's papers on relativity have in physics, remains an unopened book to a great many professional philosophers. Because of Whitehead's previous work, it was not possible to neglect *Process and Reality* altogether; but its reception by the philosophic world offers an interesting lesson. In Whitehead's earlier work, he had developed a method of analysis and certain interpretations of science that were hailed with delight by realists, analytical philosophers, and the other "tough-minded" philosophers who were supposedly fighting on the side of science against the obscurantism of idealism. His book *Symbolism: Its Meaning and Effect* and, later, *Science and the Modern World* raised some doubts in the minds of the admiring chorus. Had they been nurturing a viper in their collective bosoms? When *Process and Reality* appeared, the storm broke; the book was not read or criticized, it was cried down. It was alleged that Whitehead had betrayed his followers; that he was in his dotage; that he had allowed his scientific outlook to become obscured by the influence of his early religious upbringing; that the notion of "feeling," of central importance in the book, was completely incomprehensible since no philosopher had ever used the term in that sense before. I venture the observation that had Whitehead's book been easy to refute, its reception would not have been so bitter. As it was, most critics were faced with a difficult situation: They did not have the ability or knowledge to refute the arguments in the book; yet, the book was of such obvious importance that it could not be quite neglected. Two alternatives remained: either the straightforward recognition that Whitehead had achieved a new synthesis which made it incumbent upon most philosophers to re-examine their most cherished beliefs and, perhaps, change them; or the descent to name-calling.

Most philosophers chose the latter. Today, errors that Whitehead gave so many years of his life to overcome, persist as part of the current stock in trade of many of our established thinkers and their disciples. It has become customary to intimate that Whitehead was in his dotage when he wrote *Process and Reality* and students are encouraged to disregard one of the greatest philosophical works ever produced. It can be added, as a final comment on this topic, that a considerable part of the difficulty that reviewers ascribed to the book was a result of their own ignorance of the history of philosophy. The charge that Whitehead used the notion of "feeling" as it had never been used before, is a case in point. For an identical or closely similar notion plays a similar role in the philosophy of Plato, Descartes, Leibnitz, Locke, Hume, Bradley, Bergson, Peirce, and others. My estimate of the significance of Whitehead's work and the regret I have expressed because of its neglect, echo the following comment of Professor W. G. deBurgh: "It is strange, surely, that so pregnant and revolutionary a doctrine should not already have aroused more discussion among contemporary thinkers. For the most part they have been content . . . to pass by on the other side. Such a step-motherly attitude is hardly adequate in the face of what promises to be the most significant contribution of the last half century to the advance of philosophic inquiry."

Sympathetic readers may feel that I weaken my argument by devoting so much space to a particular example. What, they might ask, has the importance or lack of importance of Whitehead's philosophy to do with the general question of the desirability of a "catalogue of considerations" or the vanity of philosophers which, supposedly, stands in the way of the compilation of such a catalogue? There are some, perhaps, who might agree with my general thesis and yet dissent from any such exalted appraisal of Whitehead's significance as I have made in the previous paragraph. In his article, Professor Lovejoy avoided the discussion of any particular issues which he felt might prejudice his case and argued merely for a general change in method and attitude. But the passage of time has demonstrated that his arguments were not convincing. Perhaps it would be fairer to say that the "considerations" he advanced have been forgotten or overlooked. But he might have realized that this was inevitable, for he was involved in a kind of vicious circle. He

argued that many philosophic discussions and writings were valueless because in them points were made or established only by forgetting or overlooking relevant considerations. But if philosophers have the habit of overlooking relevant considerations in the interest of exhibiting their own acuteness or originality, they will find it a simple matter to overlook Professor Lovejoy's statement that this is the case. On the other hand, if they were the kind of men who were disposed to heed Professor Lovejoy's admonitions, those admonitions would not have been necessary.

The general admonition to read and study before writing falls on deaf ears because each philosopher thinks that it is directed at every other and that he himself is guiltless. There is, I feel, but one way out of this impasse; if general admonitions will not do, we must resort to particular cases. It is necessary to be more specific than was Professor Lovejoy. The discussion of Professor Whitehead represents an attempt to achieve such specificity. In other words, it is not enough to say "if the shoe fits, wear it"; because no one will take the trouble to find out the size of the shoe. In the description of the reception of Professor Whitehead's work, I have supplied the size of one shoe; those whom it fits are too well known to make necessary any naming of names. In what follows, I propose to present more sizes that fit many contemporary philosophers; or, if the metaphor is disliked, I propose to present two more examples of the kind of incompetence prevalent in philosophy and caused by lack of scholarship.

In an article which appeared some time ago, I pointed out that a certain conclusion, which is widely accepted as obvious, is not obvious and has been questioned by Locke, Leibnitz, Berkeley, Russell, and Whitehead. Six months later, in an issue of the same journal which printed this article, there appeared a review which disposed of a book by remarking that certain arguments in the book led to conclusions which contradicted this same "obvious conclusion." I have not the temerity to insist that the reviewer should have read my article, but I do think that a reviewer, who reviews a book on a certain subject and who is unaware of what Locke, Leibnitz, Berkeley, Russell, and Whitehead have said on that subject, is incompetent. Moreover, this is not all. Some months later at a meeting of the American Philosophical Association a paper was read in which

the reader stated the same "obvious conclusion" and added that he proposed to waste no time in defending or explaining something so obvious. From his large audience, not a single man rose to suggest that the conclusion seemed obvious because certain relevant considerations, which had formerly been advanced by thinkers whose importance is undeniable, were being neglected. Now I do not doubt that many of those present, in the course of their preparation to become original thinkers, had chanced upon these considerations. But you cannot exhibit critical ingenuity if you use other men's arguments; further, if that sort of answer to originality is encouraged, it might some day be directed against one's own original contributions.

My last example concerns the general reception of the work of Sir Arthur Eddington and, in particular, a book which contains a criticism of his writings. The same "toughminded" philosophers, who are bitter about Whitehead's apostasy, have also found themselves "betrayed" by the development of modern science. Philosophers, whose philosophic position had been orientated about the notion "science says . . .," were faced with the possibility, to put it bluntly, that they did not know what they were talking about. These thinkers, quite humanly, preferred to close their eyes to this possibility, and it became the fashion among philosophers to sneer at some of the most outstanding scientists. Through usage, many of these sneers have attained the dignity of "critical comments." Sir Arthur Eddington has, perhaps, been the target of more of these critical comments than any other scientist. In fact, he has been misrepresented so often on one point that he was led in the final chapter of a recent book to compile and quote passages from his previous works giving his exact views on this subject. That he should have been confronted with the necessity for doing this, is eloquent testimony to the cogency of my theme in this essay. Undoubtedly, Eddington has since learned that the compilation represented work done in vain. It had become so easy to "show up" Eddington by attributing certain views to him, that very few of his critics even bothered to read this collection of his actual views. And whatever feelings of doubt and disquiet remained among Eddington's critics has, no doubt, been dispelled by Professor Stebbing's *Philosophy and the Physicists*. This book was received with an almost uniform chorus of critical approval. It seemed thorough and scholarly and it sup-

ported all the comfortable prejudices of the philosophers who had been "left out on a limb" by the progress of science. Eddington cannot meet Professor Stebbing's attack unless he repeats, perhaps in words of one syllable, all that he has already said. I presume that he will find this prospect too tiresome and Professor Stebbing's book will stand as a devastating criticism. Students of philosophy will read it instead of the works it criticizes; then, new complaints will arise concerning the lack of progress in philosophy. Fortunately, in this case, the inadequacy and unfairness of Professor Stebbing's book can be demonstrated incontrovertibly. The fact that none of the reviewers noticed this possibility is evidence that they were so much in agreement with her conclusions that they neglected to examine her arguments, or that they knew little at first hand of the works she was criticizing. For no subtle power of reasoning is necessary in order to lay bare the inadequacy of this book; one need only apply the critical methods mastered by the tyro in historical investigation or research.

Eddington's Gifford lectures, "The Nature of the Physical World," caused a great stir in the philosophic world. A good part of this stir consisted of warnings to Eddington to remain at his physicist's lathe and leave philosophizing to the philosophers. Besides, there was much comment on Eddington's philosophical naïveté; and a great many demonstrations of the inconsistency, inadequacy, etc., of Eddington's views. I felt that much of this criticism was mistaken, but this judgment implies only an honest difference of opinion. However, when Eddington's *New Pathways of Science* appeared, the situation changed. The last fifty odd pages of this book are devoted to answering his critics and restating, as directly and as simply as he can, his philosophic position. I found these pages utterly convincing and I waited eagerly for the appearance of reviews or the answers of the critics. Let me say that I am still waiting. The book appeared in 1935 and to date it has not been reviewed by *Mind*, the *Journal of Philosophy*, or the *Philosophical Review*. Whatever the explanation, I believe that in no other field of scholarly or scientific investigation could such a lapse occur. The fact that it could occur in philosophy indicates that the philosophers constitute one important reason for the lack of progress in philosophy. But let me go on to the "cream of the jest." In the same

journals which failed to notice Eddington's book, Professor Stebbing's book was accorded the honor of extensive and, as I have already mentioned, laudatory reviews. However, none of the reviews had anything to say concerning Professor Stebbing's treatment of this definitive statement of Eddington's position which appears at the end of *New Pathways of Science*. I went to Professor Stebbing's book and discovered that, with the exception of a few scattered phrases, it contains no discussion of the most definitive statement of the view she is engaged in refuting. I submit that an examination of Eddington's beliefs, which overlooks what Eddington regards as his most thorough and strongest statement of these beliefs, is convicted on the grounds of the requirements of honest scholarship of being unfair and inadequate, to say the least. [A more recent book by Eddington, *The Philosophy of Physical Science*, has appeared and has been reviewed since this article was planned. Writing in the *Journal of Philosophy*, Professor Nagel bases a good part of an unsympathetic review on the argument that Eddington has not been sufficiently aware of, and has not modified his views to meet Professor Stebbing's criticisms. In the review which appeared in *Philosophy*, Professor Broad contributes the following passage to substantiate the thesis of this article: "When I ask my expert colleagues whether I can safely accept Eddington's conclusions in these matters, they always answer in the negative. But this does not satisfy me. For I am convinced that their unfavorable answer is *not based on a firsthand study of the arguments*." (Italics are mine.)]

I think these examples are sufficient to make my point clear, to lend teeth to the argument so well advanced by Professor Lovejoy. Hence, I shall say no more about the general question of a modern *Summa Metaphysica*. Any further discussion of this general question might well begin by going back to his article and meeting its implications directly and honestly.

If philosophy suffers by comparison with other disciplines, the reason is that, in general, philosophers know less about their subject than do students in other fields and have less timidity about expressing themselves upon matters concerning which they are uninformed. The most vocal school of present-day philosophers, those known variously as "logical positivists" or "logical empiricists," is also the group whose members are most ignorant of the history of philos-

ophy. They have made a fine art of the procedure of damning doctrines about which they know nothing, of criticizing books which they have not read, and of overlooking criticisms which they cannot meet. Lately, however, the school has shown signs of disintegration. Just as there must be honor among thieves if thievery is to flourish, so the positivists were faced with the necessity of understanding and agreeing with one another in order that they might agree in condemning all others. But the urge to be original broke out within the circle of the elect and now there are almost as many varieties of the official doctrine as there are members of the group. They have begun to accuse one another of giving comfort and succor to the enemy, i.e., all other philosophers, and the end is not far. This, in itself, might be an occasion for rejoicing, but I fear that no lesson has been learned. There is no general realization that logical positivism had its birth in what Gilson describes as that blessed state of ignorance which makes it easy for clever men to be original.

Originality, by cleverness out of ignorance, is the *bête noir* of philosophy and, in this connection, there is one final point that must be made. We hear much of the disagreement that exists among philosophers, and the existence of such disagreement is supposed to invalidate any pretension philosophic speculation may make towards being a significant source of understanding of the world we live in. In order to lay this charge, it is necessary to make a distinction between philosophers and professors of philosophy. The commodity which the members of the latter group offer in the market place is, in many cases, just this disagreement with their fellows. Further, in order to create a market for their wares, they tend to minimize or suppress the central core of doctrine which members of the first group may hold in common. The professors are so much concerned with brewing tempests in teapots that they neglect to inform their students, or the general public, that the important figures in modern philosophy, Bradley, Bergson, Peirce, James, Dewey, Whitehead, Santayana, and Russell, agree on certain fundamental questions of metaphysics. If we can dissipate the fog of controversy that tends to obscure this fact, continued progress in philosophy will become, not only possible, but probable.

B · O · O · K · S

SHAKESPEARE

THE ART AND LIFE OF WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE. By Hazelton Spencer.
New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1940. Pp. 495. \$3.00.

Professor Spencer has given us a valuable book. It brings up to date our information about the life of Shakespeare, the origin and publication of his plays and other verse, the Elizabethan stage, and the subsequent history of the presentation of the plays. The last topic receives much more attention than is paid in similar books, and offers much to the theatergoer, who likes to know what actors or actresses did the parts in the past and how. In discussing the influences on Shakespeare, Mr. Spencer grants less to Marlowe and the subdued style of *Edward II* than has been customary. He has adopted a later date for the so-called early comedies. As to the bitter comedies—a term not quite precise as he points out—he is dubious of Professor Campbell's theory which relates at least *Troilus and Cressida* to the dramatic type, "comical satire," like Jonson's works from *Every Man Out to The Poetaster*. The whole problem here involves somewhat the dates of plays, and also the unsolved relationship to Jonson's *Volpone* and such predecessors as Machiavelli's *Il Mandragola*, Middleton's amoral London comedies in the first decade of the sixteenth century, and the perplexing Tourneur.

Mr. Spencer offers in abundance sensible, acute, and inspiring criticism. He is of course quite right in finding Shakespeare fully an artist. In rejecting him as a professional philosopher, however, he tends to preclude his having a gentleman's philosophy of life. The Elizabethan gentleman appears to have been unaware that having such a philosophy constituted a flaw. Naturally he adopted a great deal of tradition, and he read in such a way as to compare the ideas of others with his own experiences. He sought no formal system for himself, and scarcely wished to dictate one to other gentlemen. But he liked to have a foundation for his thought and a vision of life as a whole in which his personal participation was often venturesome. So educated people today have become vividly conscious of the fact that upon one philosophy of life rather than another depends an entire mode of civilization. Shakespeare was thus not on the side of Machiavellianism, but on the side of the Golden Tradition.

EDGAR C. KNOWLTON.

RETELLING AN OLD STORY

THE WHIG SUPREMACY, 1714-1760. By Basil Williams. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1939. Pp. xx, 464. \$5.00.

THE FIRST MAGAZINE: *A History of the Gentleman's Magazine*. By C. Lennart Carlson. Providence: Brown University, 1938. Pp. x, 281. \$3.00.

CAROLINE OF ENGLAND: *An Augustan Portrait*. By Peter Quennell. New York: The Viking Press, 1940. Pp. 259. \$3.75.

Professor Williams was a natural choice of the editor to write the seventh volume to appear and the eleventh in the series of fourteen which will constitute the *Oxford History of England*. Of his own works he includes, appropriately enough, in his bibliography lives of Stanhope and Pitt in addition to a series of articles in the *English Historical Review* on the foreign policy of Walpole. Perhaps this very study of so many aspects of the period betrayed Professor Williams into a confidence in his general knowledge of the subject and thus tempted him to omit an examination of the whole period anew in the hope of attaining a synthesis that might add something to the familiar story. The result unfortunately makes his perhaps the least meritorious volume that has appeared in this useful series.

The plan of organization is neither chronological nor topical. If there were noteworthy changes in England in the period treated the narrative does not make them clear. The first five chapters, occupying 143 pages, after an Introduction, treat of the English System of Government under George I and George II, English Local Government and the Law, Religion and the Churches, the Social and Economic Life of the English People. The sixth and seventh chapters are allotted to the political narrative, 1714-1742. The eighth chapter interrupts this narrative to deal with the Army and Navy, 1714-1760. The political narrative is resumed in the ninth chapter, but interrupted again by two chapters on Scotland and Ireland and the Colonies and India. In the twelfth and thirteenth chapters the political story is carried to its climax in almost unrestrained eulogy of William Pitt, Earl Chatham. The last three chapters deal with Science and Historical Research, the Arts, and Literature.

Wanting a rational plan, the narrative suggests to readers little or no basis for synthesis and gives little impression of movement. The text contains many statements with which those who are familiar with the sources or who have read recent monographs will disagree. In fact, the bibliography lists items which, had the author utilized them, would have caused him to modify some points. As far as this series is concerned, unfortunately the matter is now beyond help, and a period which offered

an unusual opportunity for reinterpretation is treated in a volume that is desultory and disconnected.

A striking indication of the inadequacy of Professor Williams's book is the reference he makes to the subject with which Dr. Carlson's volume is concerned. There are two references, one near the beginning (p. 31) and the other toward the end (p. 397). In the first Professor Williams says, "So great, however, was the interest of the public in parliamentary proceedings that Boyer in his *Political State of Great Britain*, and the *London Magazine*, *Gentleman's Magazine*, and *Historical Register* provided reports of important debates." Without clarification and amplification, this statement were better omitted entirely. The other statement is even more calculated to confuse and mislead one in search of information: "The more general growth of a taste for literature is also notable. Indications of this are the increase of newspapers, of which by 1724 there were sixteen in London alone, and the growing popularity of such magazines as the *Gentleman's* and its rival the *London Magazine*, containing, besides parliamentary debates, poems and literary criticisms, Johnson's *Rambler*, Smollett's *Critical Review*, and Newberry's *Universal Chronicle*, in which the *Idler* appeared."

The chief merits of Dr. Carlson's book are the facts it contains concerning the career of Edward Cave, founder of the *Gentleman's Magazine*, and the circumstantial account of the establishment of that periodical and others of like kind. Its weakness is the author's lack of intimate acquaintance with the political atmosphere that produced these publications and facilitated their initial popular and financial success. Perhaps it is unreasonable to expect the historian of a single magazine to do the work that would be necessary to acquire this knowledge, but without it his narrative loses most of its drama and misses many points that would add importance to the story. In fact, Dr. Carlson seems to have neglected many historical monographs from which without too much expenditure of effort he might have acquired in part the knowledge he needed.

Apparently Mr. Quennell was chiefly interested in adding another title to the list of books catalogued under his name. He does not profess to add to the information already at hand concerning Queen Caroline. A good portrait would involve accuracy of line and a plausible background. Mr. Quennell seems to have obtained much of his material from the *Diary* of Lady Cowper and the *Memoirs* of Lord Hervey. Any of the other books on the Queen will better repay the reader's time.

W. T. LAPRADE.

MARLOWE: HIS LIFE AND WRITINGS

CHRISTOPHER MARLOWE. By Frederick S. Boas. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1940. Pp. 336. \$4.50.

Mr. Boas has presented an admirable study of the life and writings of Marlowe, and done so with something of an Englishman's cunning of phrase. It is a relief to find rejected the old view that the poet was without humour, and in a nonclassical age like ours, to see the subtle classical element in him brought to light. Marlowe was not only poet in the gift of verse, but poet in transmuting both the facts of quasi-history and the abstractions of a nonprofessional philosophy into such a product as Sidney might have defended. Mr. Boas has a full sense of that higher reality.

He does not profess to solve the mystery of Marlowe's death. Here, as elsewhere, the more we know, the more we find we must know in addition. Nowhere is a word of caution more needed against either the *argumentum ex silentio* or the proving of a negative. With regard to the charge of atheism, Mr. Boas repeats the fact that the word signified to Elizabethans something different from the current meaning among educated people today. The letter from Kyd regarding fragments of a theological disputation cannot be accepted at quite its face value. It was written after Marlowe had died, by a man who was in serious danger at the hands of the authorities and who had himself looked into one type of atheism—Machiavellianism—as is obvious from his creation of Lorenzo for *The Spanish Tragedy*. Many an author or scholar today would need a large bag in which to carry guilty beliefs if he were to be held responsible for all the quotations and notes that he may have taken down from divers writers.

The mystery of 2 and 3 *Henry VI* in relation to Marlowe and Shakespeare is after all not so well solved as has been taken of late. Thus Mr. Boas raises objections against believing Shakespeare to be the sole author when he points out the Marlovian trait of classical allusion. Perhaps he drops a point in his favor by finding too little in common between Marlowe and pastoral. It may be added that the novelty in the subdued style of *Edward II* is not to be explained altogether by reason of Shakespeare's influence on Marlowe. A possibly related problem, that of the authorship of the masterpiece, *Arden of Feversham*, is left unsolved by Mr. Boas, but of the identified geniuses of the time, only Marlowe appears to have had the requisite capacity.

In general Mr. Boas is convincing in his protest against the recent belittling of Marlowe. His evidence is precise, copious, and sensitive to values. The verdict is highly judicious.

EDGAR C. KNOWLTON.

THREE THESES

THE NORTH BRITON: *A Study in Political Propaganda*. By George Nobbe. New York: Columbia University Press, 1939. Pp. x, 274. \$3.00.

THE SACHEVERELL AFFAIR. By Abbie Turner Scudi. New York: Columbia University Press, 1939. Pp. 170. \$2.25.

THE GOOD LORD LYTTTELTON: *A Study in Eighteenth-Century Politics and Culture*. By Rose Mary Davis. Bethlehem, Pennsylvania: Times Publishing Company, 1939. Pp. x, 441.

Two of these monographs were written under the auspices of a department of literature; one, under that of a department of history. It would be possible to study the contents of the *North Briton* as literature; whether it would be worth while is another matter. Dr. Nobbe in fact uses the methods of a student of the history of literature. The most successful and useful chapter in his book is that allotted to the authorship, in which he undertakes to determine the writer responsible for each of the several numbers of the periodical. As regards such matters as the circumstances which produced the periodical, the function of a publication of its type at that time, or the success of the *North Briton* as compared with similar journals of its day, the author has not much to contribute. For the investigation of these subjects the method of the student of literary history is inadequate. The career of Wilkes and political journalism in his time may very well be the subjects of further fruitful study, but they will require a point of view different from that which inspired this monograph.

Dr. Scudi in *The Sacheverell Affair* almost succeeds in telling her story without referring to any of the facts which made it a noteworthy incident. Neither the preacher nor his sermon were intrinsically important. In the trial, however, the parliament and the public men of the time debated and pronounced judgment upon a matter of political significance, the question whether or not the succession to the English crown was in all cases hereditary. The trial was used by leaders out of office to effect a change in the ministry and later the termination of a successful war. The most prominent leader in these enterprises was Robert Harley, soon to become the Earl of Oxford and Mortimer. His success in capitalizing the impeachment and related circumstances made him under the Queen head of the government for the next four years. So little is Dr. Scudi aware of the role of Harley in her story that she does not include his name in her index, though it is clear from her text that Robert Harley is the person meant in two of her three entries under "Harley, Edward." Ex-

cept for a misleading item in her bibliography and a curious single footnote, there is no indication that she used the correspondence of Harley, long ago published by the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts. Defoe is identified (p. 12) as "the leading Whig satirist." The contemporary antiquarian, Hearne, is described as "one of Sacheverell's bitterest modern critics." For the admitted violence of the preacher's sermons Dr. Scudi offers the apology (p. 37), "We know that by his own principles less bitter invectives would have been sinful."

It is a pleasure to turn from monographs such as these to the thesis of Dr. Davis. Setting out under literary auspices, she soon discovered that Lyttelton was neither an author of great importance nor a "Maecenas" to the extent he is sometimes represented to have been. Accordingly, she resigned herself to the task of narrating the story of the life of a secondary political figure who nevertheless moved in the highest circles of the English ruling class. She searched in most of the appropriate places and tells on the whole a well-informed and straightforward story. Such contributions as she makes, whether in the fields of political or literary history, are matters of detail. She is more familiar with the political history in the earlier period of Lyttelton's life than in the later decades. Her judgments are not always sound, especially when she depends more upon the work of other writers than on her own reading of the sources. Unfortunately there are too many typographical errors. But students of both history and literature can consult her book with profit. Not so much can be said of the monograph by Dr. Scudi or of that by Dr. Nobbe except the chapter indicated.

W. T. LAPRADE.

HENRY VAUGHAN IN FICTION

THE SWAN OF USK: *A Historical Novel*. By Helen Ashton. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1940. Pp. 320. \$2.50.

The Swan of Usk is a historical novel which makes new additions to the knowledge of specialists along two lines, namely, the life of Henry Vaughan, seventeenth-century "metaphysical" poet, and the war between the forces of Charles I and the Roundheads, especially such engagements as were fought in the Welsh marches. A rare sense of historical values has kept the author from manufacturing "facts" for her plot, which, it must be acknowledged, is very tenuous, since the life of the poet provides the spinal column for the book, and the biographical information which Miss Ashton has presented, although new in many particulars, cannot be said to be copious. In a foreword the author points out her departures from history.

No one who wishes to escape into the past through the pleasant medium of romance or the glory of battle will care for this novel. It is too realistic. But everyone who possesses an interest in the old poet-physician who "saw eternity" will find the book completely absorbing—as will also such folk as find pleasure in reading about the troublous days of King Charles I. Miss Ashton, it may be remembered, is the lady who has told with such charm the story of the Wordsworths and Coleridge in a previous biographical novel.

CLARENCE GOHDES.

980

90

62





